DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 863 FL 014 239

AUTHOR	Mead, Robert G., Jr., Ed.
TITLE	Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning.
INSTITUTION	Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc., Middlebury, Vt.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-915432-83-8
PUB DATE	83
NOTE	168p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Northeast Conference, Box 623, Middlebury, VT 05753 ($7.95 + $2.00 postage)
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Articulation (Education); *Change Strategies; Computer Assisted Instruction; Cross Cultural Studies; *Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Fles; Higher Education; Immersion Programs; *Instructional Improvement; *Interdisciplinary Approach; International Educational Exchange; International Studies; *Interprofessional Relationship; Nontraditional Students; Professional Associations; Professional Education; *Second Language Instruction; State Departments of Education; Statewide Planning; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*Northeast Conference Teaching of Foreign Languages

ABSTRACT

The articles discuss the necessity of including foreign language as an integral part of the curriculum at all levels of instruction. The following chapters are included: "Elementary School Foreign Language: Key Link in the Chain of Learning" (rationale, innovations, immersion programs, and interdisciplinary approaches); "Foreign Language in the Secondary School; Reconciling the Dream with the Reality" (state and local leadership, Illinois and New York statewide plans, exchange programs, international studies, and computer assisted instruction); "'Nurturing the Ties that Bind': Links between Foreign Language Departments and the Rest of the Post-Secondary Educational Enterprise" (international studies, faculty development, case studies, writing in the foreign language curriculum, commercial language courses, foreign languages and professional education, new constituencies, and academic articulation); "Foreign Language and the 'Other' Student" (low achievers, socially disadvantaged, mentally handicapped, and learning disabled); and "Toward a Multidimensional Foreign Language Curriculum" (concept, development, integration, and implementation). A section is also included on the evolution of the Northeast Conference since its inception in 1954. Lists of conference officers and an index of reports since 1954 are appended. (MSE)

ED240863

NORTHEAST CONFERENCE ON THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

FOREIGN LANGUAGES: KEY LINKS IN THE CHAIN OF LEARNING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

NE Conference

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL014239

Robert G. Mead, Jr., Editor
John M. Darcey, Chairman

1983

About the Northeast Conference

It began in 1954 as an outgrowth of the Yale-Barnard Conference on the Teaching of French. During its thirty years, the focus of the annual Conference has been on effective learning of languages, all those commonly taught in this country, ancient and modern, including English as a second language.

In preparation for each annual Conference, the Chairman, with the approval of the Board of Directors, chooses a theme and appoints a team of authors to research and write on different facets of the theme. These essays comprise the *Northeast Conference Reports* which serve as the basis for the Conference keynote speech, workshops, and panels. The *Reports* are mailed to Conference preregistrants one month in advance of the Conference.

In addition to the concurrent and general sessions, there are showings of teaching films, career workshops, job exchange opportunities, and exhibits of textbooks and other teaching aids. The Conference is supported by hundreds of schools, colleges, and educational associations. Representatives of these institutional members form an Advisory Council, whose members meet at the end of each Conference to elect new Directors.

Over the years the Conference has become the largest and most influential gathering of foreign language educators in the country. Some 2,400 teachers, chairmen and supervisors from across the nation and many foreign countries now attend each annual meeting. The Northeast Conference has encouraged and aided the formation of other similar regional associations: the Southern Conference in 1965 and the Central States Conference in 1968.

The Conference has five awards: the Donald D. Walsh Foreign Language Research Grant, the annual Stephen A. Freemen Award for a published article on teaching techniques, the Foreign Language Advocate Award, the Northeast Conference Award for Distinguished Service and Leadership in the Profession presented in memory of Nelson H. Brooks, and the Northeast Conference Journalism Award for the best reporting, analysis, or commentary in daily newspapers on foreign language education for Americans.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

John M. Darcey, *Chairman*
West Hartford (Ct.) Public Schools

June K. Phillips, *Vice-Chairman*
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Jean-Pierre Berwald, *Director*
University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Richard I. Brod, *Consultant*
ADFL-MLA

Christine L. Brown, *Director*
West Hartford (Ct.) Public Schools

Anthony J. De Napoli, *Director*
Shoreham-Wading River (N.Y.) High School

James W. Dodge, *Secretary-Treasurer*
Middlebury College

Barbara E. Elling, *Director*
SUNY at Stony Brook

John S. Harrison, *Director and Local Committee Co-Chairman*
Baltimore County (Md.) Public Schools

Helen S. Lepke, *Director*
Kent State University-Trumbull Campus

Stephen L. Levy, *Director*
Roslyn (N.Y.) Public Schools

Robert G. Mead, Jr., *Editor*
University of Connecticut, Storrs

Arthur L. Micozzi, *Local Committee Co-Chairman*
Baltimore County (Md.) Public Schools

Doris Barry Owens, *Recording Secretary*
West Hartford (Ct.) Public Schools

Gloria M. Russo, *Director*
University of Virginia

Edna M. Sims, *Director*
University of the District of Columbia

Toby Tamarkin, *Ex-Chairman*
Manchester (Ct.) Community College

Remo J. Trivelli, *Director*
University of Rhode Island

Richard C. Williamson, *Director*
Bates College

Protase E. Woodford, *Director*
Educational Testing Service

Additional copies of the *Northeast Conference Reports* for all years since 1954 may be purchased from:
Northeast Conference
Box 623
Middlebury, VT 05753
Write for a current catalogue.

© 1983 by the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Inc.
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Catalogue Card Number 55-34379
ISBN 0-915432-83-8

Contents

About the Northeast Conference 1

1983 Board of Directors 2

Preface 7

Elementary School Foreign Language: Key Link in the Chain of Learning, *Myriam Met, Helena Anderson, Evelyn Braga, Nancy Rhodes* 10
Introduction 11
Why Foreign Language in the Elementary School? 12
Innovations in Elementary School Foreign Language Programs 13
Elementary-School Immersion Programs: A Focus 15
Foreign Language and Achievement: Immersion Programs 17
Foreign Language and Achievement: Other Programs 17
Foreign Language and the Elementary School Curriculum: An Interdisciplinary Approach 18
Foreign Language and the Interdependence of Disciplines 21
Conclusion 22
Notes 23

Foreign Language in the Secondary School: Reconciling the Dream With the Reality, *Alice C. Omaggio, Anthony J. DeNapoli, Paul T. Griffith, Dora F. Kennedy, Stephen L. Levy, Gladys Lipton, Helene Z. Loew* 26
Introduction 27
State-Level Leadership for Foreign Languages and International Studies: The Illinois Plan 29
Education for a Global Perspective: A Plan for New York State 32
Other State and Local Initiatives 33
Recognizing the Realities 35
Realizing the Dream: Some Beginnings 37
Exchange Programs 39
The International High School 40
The International Baccalaureate Program 43
Global Education/International Studies 44
Computer-Assisted Instruction 45
Some Conclusions and Recommendations 46
Notes 48
References 49
Appendix 50

"Nurturing the Ties that Bind": Links between Foreign Language Departments and the Rest of the Post-Secondary Educational Enterprise, *Claire Gaudiani, Patricia Cummins, Humphrey Tonkin* 54
Introduction 55
Part One: Cross-Curricular Links 56
International Studies 56
Faculty development 60
Case Studies 62
Recommendations for Change 67
Writing in the Foreign Language Curriculum — Links to the English Department 68

Part Two: Foreign Languages and the Professional Curricula 70
Introduction 70
Review of Survey of Commercial Language Courses 75
Non-Business, Professionally Related Foreign Language Courses 81
Funding Sources 82
Conclusion 83

Part Three: Links Beyond the Institution 84
Links to New Constituencies 85
Academic Articulation Links 86
Conclusions: "Les Liaisons Dangereuses" 88
Notes 90
Bibliography 93
A Bibliography for International Education 94

Foreign Language and the "Other" Student, *Vicki Galloway* 96
Introduction 96
What Do We Believe? 96
The Low Achiever 98
The Socially Disadvantaged or Mentally Handicapped Child 100
The Learning Disabled Child 107
Summary and Conclusion 112
Notes 115

Toward a Multidimensional Foreign Language Curriculum, *H. H. Stern* 120
Introduction 120
The Concept of a Multidimensional Curriculum 121
The Development of a Multidimensional Curriculum 123
Integration 133
Conclusion: The Implementation of the New Curriculum 138
Notes 138
Bibliography 141
Appendix 141

Thirty Years of the Northeast Conference: A Personal Perspective, *Jane McFarland Bourque* 147
Introduction 147
Corpus 148
Mens 151
Alma et Anima 154

1982 Recipients of the Board of Directors Award for Excellence in Language Study 156

Northeast Conference Officers and Directors Since 1954 162

Northeast Conference Reports: 1954-1983 164

Preface

The theme of the 1983 Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, "Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning," addresses two areas which seem to be of paramount concern among educators and administrators as they establish their goals for the second half of this decade. As policymakers discuss a return to the basics and the essentials of education, it is imperative that we state our case forcefully if languages are to be included as an integral part of the curriculum at all levels of instruction.

We are certainly not alone as we seek to educate not only educators but also the public in general. United States Senators and Representatives recognize the importance of the study of foreign language and international studies; more than seventy bills for establishing new programs or funding current programs in foreign language and international studies were introduced in the 97th Congress. Secretary of Education T. H. Bell stated on September 16, 1982, "I am encouraged by the new emphasis many educators place on the need for improving and expanding foreign language capabilities of our students. If technology is one of our tickets to the rest of the world, foreign language is the other." Colleges and universities are reviewing their language requirements as they, too, increasingly recognize the importance of language study as a basic element of a college education. The Organizations for the Essentials of Education, a group of national organizations representing many disciplines, stated that "the essentials of education include the ability to use language, to think, and to communicate effectively; . . (and) to understand other languages and cultures. . . ."

Three of the Reports in this volume address specific levels of instruction. Mimi Met gives a strong rationale for beginning the study of foreign languages at an early age in elementary schools. She shows how foreign languages fit into the basic goals of the elementary school curriculum. Finally, she describes models of foreign language programs and language immersion classes in elementary schools.

Alice Omaggio, Chairman of the Working Committee on Secondary Education, describes the Illinois Plan for Language and International Studies which strongly supports the study of foreign languages for all students from kindergarten through the university. She also explores the proposed plan for New York State and then examines some representative local and district-wide plans. Finally, she presents some recom-

mendations for "reconciling the dream with the reality."

The Report devoted to post-secondary institutions and written by Claire Gaudiani is divided into three parts. Part One gives examples of programs which link foreign languages with other departments in the arts and science curriculum. In Part Two she covers the link between foreign languages and business and other professional and career oriented courses — an area which she thinks will show substantial growth in the next five years. In Part Three she suggests some future directions that link foreign languages to other disciplines. She concludes that the future is very bright for the continuing development of interdisciplinary programs with a foreign language component.

Vicki Galloway, in her Report, reminds us that high schools are not just preparatory schools for colleges but also preparatory schools for life. She then discusses the socially disadvantaged and learning disabled students and what we can do to accommodate the needs of these students in our foreign language programs.

H. H. Stern, in the fifth Report, presents his concept of a multidimensional curriculum. He would divide the curriculum into four major categories or content areas and would create four syllabuses which, he emphasizes, should not be treated in isolation but rather as interdependent components of the foreign language curriculum. He describes each syllabus and then shows how one might "cut across the syllabus divisions."

Finally, Jane Bourque reviews the first thirty years of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and rewards us with her warm and perceptive reminiscences.

If the study of foreign languages is to prosper and expand in the United States, we must make sure that we are not an island for the elite but part of the basic curriculum and linked with other disciplines in that curriculum. We hope that the 1983 *Reports*, in the tradition of previous *Reports*, inform and inspire you as you forge these links.

John M. Darcey

Myriam Met, *Chair. Supervisor, Foreign Languages, ESL and Bilingual Education Cincinnati Public Schools*

Contributors:

Helena Anderson, *Foreign Language Specialist, Milwaukee Public Schools*

Evelyn Brega, *Former Coordinator of Foreign Languages, Lexington (Mass.) Public Schools*

Nancy Rhodes, *Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.*

Elementary School Foreign Language: Key Link in the Chain of Learning

Introduction

The report of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies (1979) highlighted the urgent need for increased enrollments in foreign language courses of study, and recommended that such study begin in the elementary school. These recommendations came at a time when educators were increasingly concerned with the need to improve student achievement in the "basic skills", and therefore tended to look askance at suggestions for additions to the elementary curriculum.

Foreign language instruction, however, can be integrated with the current elementary curriculum so that rather than detract from the quality of the child's educational program, it will enrich and enhance it. By expanding our view of "the basics" to a broader definition of the essentials of education, it becomes clear that the elementary content areas and foreign language can be taught concurrently and thereby contribute to achievement in both "the basics" and foreign language.

Since 1978, major professional organizations have worked to expand the narrow definition of the "basic skills" implied by the language of congressional legislation. Alarmed by a growing trend to limit a basic education to the traditional 3 R's these groups have called for an approach to instruction that recognizes the value of all disciplines as essential to a quality education. The "Essentials of Education," as endorsed by major educational professional organizations, calls for a curriculum which is *interdependent* and *interdisciplinary*. An essential education is interdependent in that certain skills, processes, and abilities (such as problem solving) lie at the core of education and may be developed through study of various disciplines. An essential education is interdisciplinary in that subject areas are mutually reinforcing. In an interdisciplinary approach it is assumed that the various disciplines complement and reinforce one another.

The essentials of education recognize that while all subject areas contribute to the development of underlying concepts, skills and processes (i.e., are interdependent)

and, that while good instruction is interdisciplinary, each subject area has content which makes unique contributions to the child's education which cannot be duplicated by study of any other discipline. One learns to play the violin only through violin lessons. Multiplication tables must be learned. The life cycle of the moth is content unique to the science curriculum. One learns a foreign language by direct experience with it. For this reason, a curriculum which focuses only on the 3 R's denies students content information crucial to their success as future participants in national life and as citizens of our country.

This Report focuses on the role of foreign language instruction in the elementary school. After reviewing the rationale for beginning foreign language study in the elementary school, the report describes the current status of elementary school foreign language programs. Then a detailed look at immersion, a fast growing and highly successful elementary school foreign language model, provides an example in which a foreign language may be integrated with the elementary school curriculum. The Report then describes how both immersion and other foreign language models may be an integral part of an essential education — interdependent and interdisciplinary components of the students' elementary school experience.

Why Foreign Language in the Elementary School?

While arguments in favor of foreign language study may be as old as the Tower of Babel, compelling evidence in favor of beginning such study at an early age accumulates. Beginning the language program in the primary grades has several advantages. First, it is simply good common sense that the longer students spend mastering a skill, the more proficient they become at it. Students who begin foreign language in kindergarten have the thirteen years of their academic career to become fluent in the language and knowledgeable of the culture of another people. Those who begin in grade seven have only six years. Those who begin in grade nine, even fewer. Further, using the typical secondary school 50-minute period, five periods weekly as an example, the average high school student has available a total of 166 hours a year to learn a foreign language. Multiplied by a three-year course of study, a high school student beginning foreign language in grade nine has only 498 hours of exposure.

Let us put these statistics in perspective:

> The language achievement of the six-year-old without schooling in comparison with students in school is striking. By the age of six, a child has listened to his or her native language for 17,520 hours, which is a conservative estimate based on eight hours a day for 365 days for six years. During those six years, let's estimate that the child has produced vocalizations only one hour per day, which amounts to 2,190 hours. In comparison, the student in the classroom in one year has listened to a foreign language for 320 hours and has produced vocalizations for 27 hours, assuming the student talks 10 minutes per class meeting.
>
> The figures are not impressive until they are converted into a different frame of reference. For instance, if we expect the student in the classroom to have the fluency of a six-year-old, the student should listen to the foreign language for 55 years of

college instruction and the student should have the opportunity to vocalize in the foreign language for 81 years of college instruction.[1]

If the foreign language program begins in the elementary school, students may improve their proficiency at the secondary and post-secondary levels. Students interested in commerce, diplomacy, or some other field in which foreign language is an ancillary skill may branch out in later grades, acquiring the specific language skills which will facilitate and enhance their performance in the world of work.

The enthusiasm and aptitude which young children demonstrate for language learning also make the elementary age an ideal time to begin. Children's motivation to learn another language is strong and tends to remain so, unlike adults, who often begin enthusiastically but tend to become discouraged quickly. One reason for that is the topics introduced at the beginning levels of language courses — the numbers, colors, and the family — are at a level appropriate to the interests and intellectual needs of children. Few adults can sustain an abiding interest in discussing the colors of objects in the classroom. Further, many good language teaching strategies and games are exciting for children but are viewed as undignified by older learners.

If these reasons for elementary school second language study were not enough, the research on the effect of second language study should convince non-believers. A landmark study by Peal and Lambert in 1962 revealed that children who are fluent in two languages performed better on measures of verbal and non-verbal intelligence than monolinguals, and generally demonstrated more diversified mental abilities.[2]

In San Antonio, a study of bilingual children showed them to be better problem solvers that their monolingual peers.[3] Similar results were reported by Landry who found that children who studied a foreign language in elementary school were better at divergent thinking tasks than those who did not.[4]

Many communities have come to recognize the value of beginning language study in the elementary school. A University of Michigan survey recently found that almost 75 percent of the respondents thought foreign language should be taught in the elementary grades.[5] In city after city around the country, school districts are reinstating or initiating elementary school language programs.[6]

Innovations in Elementary School Foreign Language Programs

Increased national interest in foreign languages has sparked new enthusiasm for programs in elementary schools. Programs with varying goals and curricula have been developed as a result of cooperative efforts of parents, teachers, administrators, and community leaders. Depending on the program, goals range from general familiarization with the basics of language and culture to the acquisition of a high level of oral proficiency.

In 1981, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) surveyed a sampling of 1,237 schools in eight states to find out how much early language instruction was going on and what teaching methods were being used.[7] Of the 453 schools that responded, about one out of five (18 percent) reported that they do teach foreign language. The

types of programs found in these states and the rest of the country include (1) immersion, (2) "revitalized FLES," and (3) "foreign language experience" (FLEX). The programs can be described as follows:

IMMERSION

Immersion refers to programs that teach the regular elementary school curriculum through a foreign language. The foreign language is the *medium* of instruction rather than the object of instruction. In a total immersion program, from the first day of kindergarten English speaking children are spoken to only in Spanish, German or French by their teachers. They listen to stories, learn the colors and numbers, study about health and safety, play games, and do all the usual kindergarten activities . . . but in the foreign language. Students continue studying all their subjects in the foreign language until second or third grade, when an English language arts class is introduced. From then on, the number of classes taught in English is increased in the upper grades (3-6) to 20-50%, depending on the program.

Partial immersion programs, a variation of total immersion, teach up to half of the subjects in the foreign language. A main difference between partial and total immersion is the amount of time spent at the beginning studying in the foreign language. Whereas total immersion students begin by studying everything in the second language, partial immersion students begin by studying half of the curriculum in the second language. Partial immersion programs aim at developing foreign language proficiency and cultural awareness.

REVITALIZED FLES

Revitalized FLES programs are those where foreign language is taught before, during, or after school for a specific number of days per week. Today's revitalized language classes emphasize spoken language more than FLES programs used to, and include a cultural awareness component. Revitalized FLES programs differ in some ways from their antecedents of the 1950s and 1960s. Earlier programs were in response to the concerns of the Sputnik era, and fed largely upon federal dollars allocated to narrow America's educational gap, while today's FLES programs tend to gain their impetus in a "grass roots" movement — a community based desire for foreign language study. Thus, revitalized FLES programs are usually financed by local communities themselves. Where yesterday's programs set high expectations, such as language proficiency at the end of the FLES sequence, (promises that often were difficult to fulfill), today's FLES tends to have more realistic expectations. Having learned from past successes and failures, today's programs are able to utilize the strengths of previous FLES approaches as basic building blocks.

Revitalized FLES programs use interesting textbooks with amusing cartoons and accompanied by audiotapes of realistic situations that are very appealing to the students. These programs can be sponsored by the school itself, parent-teacher associations, county education programs, or, as found more recently, private language schools who realize the growing interest in language instruction for children as well as adults.

As well as working towards cultural awareness, FLES aims at achieving a certain amount of listening and speaking skills in the foreign language and, to a lesser degree, reading and writing skills. Revitalized FLES programs are more concerned with working toward specific language and cultural goals than were the FLES programs of

the 1960s. The degree of proficiency aimed at varies among programs and depends on, among other factors, the amount of time available for language classes.

Daily foreign language classes may be supplemented with additional English-medium study of the foreign language and its culture during other classes. This is accomplished in schools that "interface" the curriculum: teachers reinforce language concepts and emphasize cultural studies during geography, social studies, reading, art, and music classes. Foreign language activities can also be supplemented with discussions of various cultures, writing to pen pals in another country, taking field trips to museums or cultural centers, and obtaining speakers from the community.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE EXPERIENCE (FLEX)

FLEX programs — with less ambitious goals than either immersion or FLES — aim to introduce children to foreign sounds, words, and phrases, as well as to basic aspects of a foreign culture. FLEX is designed to develop careful listening skills and to help students experience success in their initial contact with the foreign language. The program attempts to establish a firm foundation for subsequent language study. Many schools offer a sequence of short FLEX courses in several languages, to give children the opportunity to study more than one language and make an intelligent choice about what language to continue studying in secondary school. Topics covered in FLEX classes include greetings, colors, numbers, classroom objects, family, clothing, telling time, weather, days of the week, months, and seasons. Cultural lessons are integrated into the daily classes.

An advantage of FLEX is that the classes can be taught by a teacher who does not have a high level of proficiency in the foreign language. In a FLEX program in Indiana, teachers attend a two-day training session, receive self-instructional materials and tapes, and then learn the language together with the students. FLEX classes in Spanish, French, German, Italian, Russian, Chinese, and Latin are popular in schools in Kansas, Maryland, Missouri, Indiana, and several other states. Whereas some of these programs use classroom teachers, others use parents and high school and college students as instructors to teach FLEX. Often the teachers are volunteers who get high school or college credit for teaching.

Elementary School Immersion Programs: A Focus

Of the three types of elementary programs (immersion, FLES, and FLEX) total immersion sets the highest goals in terms of language proficiency. Students are expected to master the regular curriculum and also become "functionally fluent" in the foreign language. This means that fifth and sixth graders should be able to communicate in the foreign language (on topics appropriate to their age) as well as ten and eleven year olds native to the foreign country. These fifth and sixth graders also aim at acquiring an understanding and appreciation of other countries. Since 1972, when the United States' first immersion program was started in Culver City, California, at least fourteen other school systems have introduced such programs including Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Cincinnati, Ohio; Holliston, Massachusetts; Orem, Utah; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Rochester and Plattsburgh, New York; San Diego and San Lorenzo, California; Silver Spring and Chevy Chase, Maryland; Tulsa,

Oklahoma; and Washington, D.C.

Of all foreign language models, immersion most closely knits language study into the pattern of the school curriculum. Immersion simply means a program in which the usual curriculum activities are conducted in a second language which is the medium of instruction rather than the object of instruction. It can begin at any level — in elementary school, where it is called early immersion, or in middle school or high school where it is called late immersion. In different kinds of immersion programs the amount of time each day spent in the second language can also vary. In total immersion programs, the second language is used for the entire school day during the first two or three years of the program. In partial immersion programs, instruction takes place in the second language for part (usually at least half) of the school day.

Early total immersion programs take advantage of children's ease of language acquisition in a natural setting where the new language is the only means of communication. From the minute the children arrive at school in the morning, they hear only the second language from the teacher. All classroom conversation and instructions are in the new language. In this way, children acquire the second language naturally in play and work situations such as: "I have hot lunch today," "Can we go out for recess?" "Give me the ball." "I want to be first!" "May I go to the bathroom?"

The second language is the tool through which the other subjects are taught. The emphasis is on the learning activity (reading, math, social studies, art, science, etc.) not the language. In this setting the second language is acquired in much the same way as the first language — through listening and speaking.

Children show little anxiety about learning in another language because the things they learn are within their experience. They learn to speak and read about things they understand: in kindergarten, a visit to the zoo; in second grade, a lesson on magnets; in fifth grade, a lesson on United States geography.

The curriculum in an early immersion program is basically the same as the curriculum in any elementary school. Students have reading, mathematics, language arts, science, social studies, art, music, and physical education. At the kindergarten level, in addition to such regular activities as getting to know each other, learning to follow directions, and identifying colors and shapes, the children become aware of the sounds of the new language. They learn short sentences in the second language and begin to understand the language when someone else speaks it. Although the kindergarteners may — and do — use English, the teacher encourages them to use the second language vocabulary and expressions with which they are comfortable.

After two or three years in a total immersion program, when children have acquired comprehension and can easily generate all needed speech in the second language, English is introduced as a language arts subject for 30 minutes to an hour each day in the second or third grade. As the students progress through the middle grades, the amount of English is gradually increased until in grades five or six, there is a balance of both the second language and English. The end result is that upon leaving an early total immersion program, students have not only completed the regular elementary curriculum, but are able to begin middle school or junior high school with bilingual skills sufficient to take subject content classes in either language.

Foreign Language and Achievement: Immersion Programs

Questions about achievement have been a common concern expressed by parents who feared that children in immersion programs would fall behind the traditional English only classes. This question, as well as others, has been well researched in Canada over the past fifteen years. There are approximately 50,000 children in all parts of Canada currently involved in immersion programs. One third of kindergarten students beginning school in Ottawa are enrolled in French immersion programs.

The positive effects of early immersion have been well documented in longitudinal studies beginning with the well known *Bilingual Education of Children* by Lambert and Tucker and continuing with the many studies done under the auspices of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.[8] The research on early immersion is not only reassuring about achievement, but also indicates desirable side effects. A recent paper written by Merrill Swain summarizes the research related to immersion programs in Canada for the past ten years:[9]

Effects on English Skills

By the end of grade 4, the immersion students and their English educated peers perform equivalently. By the end of grade 5 the immersion students often outperform the comparison groups on several aspects of measured English skills, for example, reading comprehension and vocabulary knowledge.

Effects on Second Language Skills

The results reveal consistently superior performance in French skills as compared to students who have had a traditional program of French instruction. The results also show that the immersion students score as well on French proficiency instruments as 80% of the native-speaking students.

Effects on the Learning of Subject Content Material

On standardized tests given in English, science, social studies and mathematics, the immersion students who had been taught the subject matter in French, perform as well as their monolingual peers.

Other Effects of Immersion Programs

Many studies show that bilingualism can positively influence aspects of cognitive and linguistic growth.

Foreign Language and Achievement: Other Programs

Concerns about achievement in "the basics" are also voiced by educators and parents involved with FLES programs. It is assumed that taking time out of the school day for foreign language may detract from achievement in other subject areas. The issue of foreign language study and achievement has been investigated repeatedly with similar results: study of a foreign language in elementary school has no negative effect on achievement in other areas. Quite the contrary, considerable evidence is available that the achievement of students in such programs equals, if not surpasses,

that of their peers.[8] Significantly, such data include urban, integrated school populations.

Another frequent concern of educators and parents is the place of foreign languages in the school curriculum. After all, the school day is filled already. How can we possibly add more without sacrificing some other important skill area? The reply is simple: foreign language is not extrinsic to or separate from the curriculum; it can be integrated with almost every other curricular area in such a way that each serves as a vehicle for teaching the other. Foreign language can enhance concept development and skill acquisition in language arts, social studies, math, science, physical education, art, and music. (And, vice versa.)

Foreign Language and the Elementary School Curriculum: An Interdisciplinary Approach

LANGUAGE ARTS

Learning another language contributes to students' growing awareness of the role and use of their own language. Often, students come to realize that verbs have endings which must match their subjects, that pronouns may be substituted for nouns, and that tense markers tell when an event took place. Students gain an appreciation for the importance of choosing the right word and the possible consequences of incorrect choices. Foreign language teachers enable students to understand the importance and role of non-verbal behaviors in communication through a variety of activities such as charades. The telling of folk tales, fairy tales and fables is a frequent activity in elementary school foreign language classrooms, and one which provides exposure to the literature and legends of other lands. Follow-up activities such as skits and role-play provide opportunities for creative dramatics. Foreign language activities which involve practice in the use of the telephone and telephone courtesy reinforce an aspect of communications skills frequently found in primary curricula.

When second language reading skills are taught, they reinforce those of the English reading program. A child does not learn to read twice: basic concepts such as the symbolic value of letters, the fact that strings of letters stand for sounds that make words (and words, sentences), that reading progresses from left to right, etc., are ideas consistent with the systems of the more commonly taught foreign languages. Most of the sounds represented by consonants in French, German, and Spanish are the same as in English; it is the vowels that differ most. And, unlike the frustrations they experience with English, many younger readers find comfort in the consistency of the phonic patterns of German and Spanish.

Writing skills are also a part of the foreign language curriculum for intermediate level students. To practice specific structures and vocabulary, students are asked to fill in the blank balloon of comic strips just as they do in English creative writing activities. A unit on letter writing acquaints students with linguistically and culturally appropriate forms of address and closings, while reinforcing basic letter writing skills (i.e., a letter has a salutation, body and closing) first developed in English. Patterned poems such as those taught in the English language arts curriculum (e.g., diamante, cinquain) can be successfully done in the more advanced second language elementary school classroom. More advanced students may also use foreign language

newspapers to increase their understanding of the target culture, while simultaneously gaining additional exposure to skills related to the newspaper.

SOCIAL STUDIES

If any area of the elementary curriculum is closely aligned with foreign language study, it is the social studies. A sound foreign language program considers language as one of many socio-anthropological characteristics of a people and their institutions. Language, thus viewed, is the thread that weaves and binds the fabric of life. It is impossible to learn a language without learning about its culture. Therefore, in developing areas of vocabulary, foreign language teachers can also develop significant cross-cultural understandings. For example, family vocabulary taught to primary age children may serve as a springboard for exploring kinship patterns of the target culture in keeping with the basic concepts of the social studies curriculum: that people live in families, that families are composed of several members, each playing a role in the life of the family, etc. Food vocabulary lends itself to a discussion of what kinds of foods are eaten in the target culture and how these are prepared. Vocabulary relating to the school community is a means of exposing children to schooling patterns of other cultures. Children are often not aware that many children around the world go to school just as they do, and study similar subjects.

The culture component of the foreign language program can and should emphasize the conceptual generalizations which lie at the core of the elementary social studies curriculum. Cross-cultural similarities should be stressed, so that students come to realize that people the world over are similar: they live in families and communities, work, have pleasures and needs. The foreign language curriculum helps students see that all people have certain basic needs (food, shelter, clothing) but the ways in which these needs are met may differ among cultures. Thus, the generalizations of the elementary school social studies curriculum can be exemplified by the culture of the language studied. When studying communities around the world, students of Spanish may elect to study a community in Mexico. In studying how land availability and irrigation patterns make communities different, the farm pattern typical of some areas of Germany (with houses clustered in town and the fields outlying), may be contrasted with the American farm patterns. The social studies unit on work in the community may be used in the foreign language program to teach community worker vocabulary and to discuss jobs that may or may not be available in the American and non-American communities. Such a discussion helps students to see that different occupations such as the French *concierge* or the Spanish *portero* reflect the choices communities make about the goods and services they desire. Rudimentary map skills can be practiced as students study vocabulary relating to their town, its stores, and the terms for left, right, north, east, west, and south, directing one another on trips around town using simple maps. A similar integration of the social studies and foreign language curricula can be done with units on transportation and communication systems.

Study of the culture of another language group also develops student awareness of the influence of that culture and its people on our own. Students thus become more aware of how the target culture may have influenced and also continues to influence our daily lives, in what we eat (pretzels, tacos, crepes), our homes (architectural styles in our community), what we say (foreign loan words now a part of English), and the holidays we celebrate (Columbus Day, Halloween).

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE

In the areas of mathematics and science, simple arithmetic operations may be drilled once numbers are taught in the second language. (Indeed, recent achievement results from Milwaukee indicate high achievement in math even when English speaking students receive their entire math instruction in another language.[8]) In teaching the color of eyes and hair, language teachers may survey the class and help students make a graph to depict how many have blue, brown, green eyes, etc. Students may also be exposed to such cross-cultural contrasts as the European custom of using the thumb to indicate one (we use the index finger), the European method of multiplication and division, and, of course, the metric system.

Scientific terms are similar in many languages, and students can often follow experiments conducted in another language. Basic nutrition can be taught when students study the foreign language vocabulary for foods, discussing which foods are appropriate to different meals, what a balanced meal or diet is, and what the basic human food requirements are. Other foreign language/science units may focus on the study of fauna and flora indigenous to other countries, including related first and second language terminology. A science unit on the weather is the ideal time to chart the temperature and rainfall (as reported in the daily newspaper or almanac) of cities in a country where the language is spoken as well as to develop the skills of students to discuss these concepts in the other language.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

In physical education, students may learn playground games and sports typical of the target culture while learning the foreign language terminology needed to play them. A study of tennis in French may bring to light the origin of the English words tennis *(tenez)* and love *(l'oeuf)*. Soccer is probably the most popular world sport today; hockey, la crosse, and bocci are all sports to be included in the foreign language curriculum. World events such as the Tour du Monde and World Cup soccer tournaments may be the basis of class projects. Folk dances, which have long been a means of incorporating culture in foreign language classes, are also a part of the physical education curriculum.

MUSIC

Music activities include the study of folk songs, choral singing, and singing in rounds with traditional songs of other countries. A study of rhythm can highlight the syncopation characteristic of much Latino music or the oom-pah-pah we often associate with German bands. Many songs children already know in English originated or exist in other languages such as "Frère Jacques," "Alouette," and "Silent Night." And, a study of musical instruments may acquaint students with the names and kinds of instruments popular in the target culture, common musical terms (piano, fortissimo, allegro), and may also involve students in making and playing their own simple rhythm instruments (such as maracas) in class.

ART

Many foreign language teaching activities can take place during art class. Students may illustrate vocabulary or other topics for bulletin board displays or make multidimensional collages which depict a unit of study (for example, illustrating the words rough, smooth, soft, hard, etc.). Typical crafts of the target culture may be taught

during art, such as the yarn paintings and piñatas of Mexico or *Scherenschnitte*, the intricate scissor-cut paper designs of Germany. Such art projects may also serve to reinforce cultural concepts. For example, students studying toy vocabulary in Spanish may learn about a simple toy played with by Hispanic children called a *balero* and make one in art. German students may decorate eggs in art class when learning about the cultural significance of the German egg tree. Before the invention of the camera, a popular portrait form was developed in France by Etienne de Silhouette, and students of French may learn more about these black-on-white portraits in art.

In the elementary school, foreign language can permeate the total classroom experience as well as the curriculum. It can respond to all the senses; it can reflect the value system of the target culture and language. Children can enter to music (sound). Teachers can spray the room with perfume (smell) on Monday, and then have a spray of garlic cloves in the room on Tuesday to study the delectable, delightful, powerful role of garlic. They can display a large bouquet of chrysanthemums in the room to discuss the meaning of flowers in other countries (e.g., chrysanthemums are "Flores para los muertos," and not to be presented as a gift, etc.). Universal expressions and courtesy phrases can be displayed all around the room. A loaf of bread hanging from the ceiling is the basis for a lesson about "good as gold" as opposed to "good as bread."

Foreign Language and the Interdependence of Disciplines

It should be clear from the above that elementary school foreign languages can be successfully integrated into the elementary curriculum without detracting from the goals of either the curriculum itself or from those of the foreign language program.

This integration of goals can be achieved in another way as well. Schooling is intended to provide learners not only with specific knowledge, but also with certain skills and abilities. Some examples of these are problem solving, conceptualization, self-expression, etc. The various subjects of the curriculum can and do enable learners to grow in these skills and abilities, each discipline contributing in its own way. Thus, the various disciplines are *interdependent*, all developing parallel, underlying processes, skills and abilities through diverse approaches and experiences. The study of a second language in the elementary school may contribute to the development of such processes, skills, and abilities, as described below:

HYPOTHESIZING

Language learners generate their own grammar of the language being learned by formulating and testing hypotheses about the rules of language. Such "interlanguage" represents the child's efforts at developing a system for the encoding of language features.

SELF-EXPRESSION

Individuals communicate in styles particular to themselves that include such features as intonation, word choice and minor variations in word order. Further, learners acquire individual communication styles that vary with context (e.g., classroom or playground) and particularly, social register (talking to parents vs. peers). Students thus acquire facility in giving expression to their unique ideas, thoughts,

personality, etc., through language.

COMMUNICATION

Second language learners increasingly become aware that they are acquiring a tool that facilitates human interaction and become adept at making choices in the selection of vocabulary and grammatical features that enhance the effectiveness of that tool. They also become sensitive to the role of non-verbal communication, and learn that non-verbal behaviors and their significance may vary between their first and second language and culture.

The ability to use language to get things done (functional language use, e.g., learning how to make requests, clarify, open or close conversations) is a skill or process common to study of one's first and additional languages, and crucial to the mastery of language as a communication device.

SYMBOLIZATION

The study of a second language heightens the child's understanding of the symbolic and arbitrary nature of language, i.e., that language is a symbolic system for organizing and labeling human experience. Practice in using the new language enables the child to apply new symbols to both new and previously acquired concepts.

CONCEPTUALIZATION

Underlying motivations and causes for human behavior are better understood through the study of another culture (which is an integral part of foreign language study). The conceptual generalizations of the elementary school social studies curriculum and those of the foreign language culture component coincide.

COGNITIVE MAPPING

Semantic networks form the basis of the brain's storage of language. (e.g., a network may include various lexical items linked to the word "dog" — Chihuahua, Great Dane, collie, etc.) In second language study semantic networks are reinforced, enriched and expanded as students both acquire new labels for known concepts and are exposed to concepts and their expression in the second language which do not exist in their first language (e.g., students acquire the new concept of social forms of address — formal and informal — and their language expressions, as in the French *tu* and *vous*).

Conclusion

Elementary school foreign languages are a key link in the chain of learning. Foreign languages are essential to a basic education, for they are intrinsic to the development of the repertoire of knowledge, skills and abilities that students must master to become successful participants in the fabric of American life.

An essential education integrates all subject areas so that they are interdependent and interdisciplinary. Whether school subjects are taught with the foreign language as the medium of instruction (as in immersion) or whether foreign language is a subject of instruction (as in FLES, FLEX and other models) it is clear that foreign languages can be successfully integrated into the curriculum so that students may master foreign language skills while growing in academic skills and cognitive abilities.

Elementary school foreign language programs thus enrich the student's education while addressing the serious need in this country for persons fluent in another language — a need clearly delineated in the report of the President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies.[10] And those who as of a few years ago cried "FLES is dead" should take another look at what is currently going on in elementary schools. Immersion, FLEX, and revitalized FLES are setting a new wave for the future.

Elementary school language instruction of the 1980s differs from that of the past decade in that programs today are being very clear about their goals: immersion programs are working toward the advanced goal of functional fluency; revitalized FLES programs emphasize speaking and listening and to a lesser degree, reading and writing; FLEX programs have the more modest goal of providing an exposure to the basic concepts of language and culture. In all instances, clarity about goals helps students, parents, and school administrators develop appropriate expectations about the language outcomes of the program and maintain a commitment to a quality, basic education.

As a profession, foreign language educators have committed themselves to supporting the Essentials of Education statement. As practitioners, there is a growing number engaged in making our documentary commitment a substantive reality today for the thousands of children currently in elementary school foreign language classrooms and benefitting from their studies. An integrated, interdisciplinary, interdependent elementary school foreign language program can and does make a significant contribution to children's educational experience. The only limits to such an approach are our imagination and our commitment to making it happen.

Notes

1. Asher, James J. *Learning Another Language Through Actions.* Los Gatos, California: Sky Oaks Publications, 1977, p. 2.

2. Peal, Elizabeth and Lambert, Wallace. "The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence," *Psychological Monographs*, 1962, 76(27), no. 546.

3. Kessler, Carolyn and Quinn, Mary Ellen. *Bilingualism and Science Problem-Solving Ability.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. San Francisco, March 1980.

4. Landry, Richard G. "A Comparison of Second Language Learners and Monolinguals on Divergent Thinking Tasks at the Elementary School Level," *Modern Language Journal*, 1974, 58, pp. 10-15.

5. Eddy, Peter A. "Foreign Languages in the USA: A National Survey of American Attitudes and Experience," in *President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies: Background Papers and Studies.* Washington, D.C., 1979. (ERIC Ed 179 117)

6. For further information see: Met, Myriam, "The Rebirth of Foreign Languages in the Elementary School," *Educational Leadership*, 1980, 37 (4), pp. 321-323.

7. For more information on elementary school foreign language programs contact: Elementary School Foreign Language Project, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3520 Prospect St., NW, Washington, DC 20007.

8. Substantiating data on achievement in programs cited and/or currently in operation may be found in:

Horstmann, Carmen Castells. "The Effect of Instruction in Any of Three Languages on the Development of Reading in English Speaking Children." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1979.

Lambert, W. and Tucker, G.R., *The Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment.* Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House, 1972.

Ozete, Oscar. "Milwaukee's French/German/Spanish Immersion Success," *Hispania*, 1980, 63, pp. 569-571.

Skiff, Diane P. *Evaluation of Alternative Programs*, 1978-1979. Cincinnati Public Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio, December 1979.

9. Swain, Merrill, "What Does Research Say About Immersion Education?", *So You Want Your Child To Learn French?*, Ottawa, Canadian Parents For French, 1979.

10. Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. A Report to the President from The President's Commission on Foreign and International Studies, 1979.

Addendum

A booklet for parents, teachers, and school administrators on how to start a foreign language program in the elementary school will soon be available from the Center for Applied Linguistics. The following questions will be answered: Why should young children learn a foreign language? What are my goals and what type of program do I want? How do I start a FLES, FLEX or immersion program? How can I evaluate my program? What other activities can foreign language students participate in? Whom can I contact about specific programs? Where can I find more information on early foreign language? Entitled *Foreign Language in the Elementary School: A Practical Guide* and written in a non-technical popularized style, it will discuss fully the concepts of immersion, FLES, and FLEX. It will present the goals of each program and elaborate the critical factors for success of any such program.

Committee Members

Alice C. Omaggio, *Chair*
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Anthony J. DeNapoli
Shorham-Wading River (N.Y.) Public Schools
Paul T. Griffith
Illinois State Board of Education
Dora F. Kennedy
Prince George's County (Md.) Public Schools
Stephen L. Levy
Roslyn (N.Y.) Public Schools
Gladys Lipton
Anne Arundel County (Md.) Public Schools
Helene Z. Loew
New York State Education Department

Foreign Language in the Secondary School: Reconciling the Dream with the Reality

Introduction

> The insights, attitudes, and skills that can be acquired through the pursuit of foreign languages and international studies are indispensable components of education for the future. . . . Foreign language and international studies should no longer be viewed as elitist areas, but as part of a core curriculum, open to and required of all students in public, private, parochial, and independent schools.
>
> — Report of the Illinois Task Force on Foreign Language and International Studies, 1979

The concept of the inclusion of foreign languages as part of a core curriculum required of all students, while certainly not new, is somewhat revolutionary in the 1980s. Yet it represents a vision of public education that is shared by a growing number of American educators, who, encouraged by the recommendations of the President's Commission, have become more vocal about their views. Many of these educators feel that strengthening foreign language and global education programs in the nation's schools is an important first step in accepting the challenge to create a citizenry that is truly prepared to live in an interdependent world. The quality and quantity of curricular innovations eventually achieved will be dependent upon the acceptance of certain basic premises, which might include the following:

(1) Opportunities to study at least one foreign language should be made available to all students at all levels of instruction.
(2) International studies/global education should be represented in the curricula of all students at all levels.
(3) Foreign language and cultural learning should be integrated at all levels with all aspects of the curriculum, particularly with the language arts and social studies.
(4) Foreign language and cultural studies are indispensable ingredients in any global education or interntional studies curriculum and vice versa.

(5) The development of competencies in foreign languages requires extended and uninterrupted sequences of study.
(6) Foreign language and cross-cultural competencies are important skills for careers, advanced study, and meaningful use of leisure time.[1]

In addition to these general premises about programs, basic goals for learners might be advanced. Specifically, students should have the opportunity, through the study of foreign languages and cultures, to:

(1) develop an appreciation of linguistic and cultural diversity;
(2) enhance their understanding of their own culture and heritage;
(3) understand their role as citizens in an interdependent world and appreciate the worth of their fellow participants in the system;
(4) develop skills in analyzing and interpreting cultural behavior without making stereotypic or ethnocentric generalizations;
(5) develop at least a working proficiency in one or more languages that will enable them to use the language(s) for communication with native speakers, as well as in their careers both at home and abroad; and
(6) acquire transferable skills and insights to facilitate the learning of additional languages, as well as to enhance language arts skills and enrich other areas of the curriculum.[2]

These are only some of the possible components of the vision in which foreign languages and international studies would play a significant role in public education of the future. It is clear that such a vision remains, for the most part, a dream yet to be realized. Indeed, any realization of that dream presupposes that students will have access to a wide variety of language-learning opportunities and experiences, with foreign languages and cultural learnings presented in extended sequences throughout the course of schooling.

This Report is designed to assess in some fashion the extent to which aspects of that dream are being realized in the nation's secondary schools. A Report of this size and scope, of course, can only hope to scratch the surface of such a vast area of inquiry. We have chosen, therefore, to try to characterize some of the current activity in secondary school programs through a sampling of state and local initiatives, realizing that many other programs exist or are under way that we have not described. It is our hope that such an appraisal, though modest in its proportions, may shed some light on the state of foreign language study in the secondary schools and suggest some directions for reconciling the vision with the realities facing the profession in the 1980s.

In the first section of this Report, a description of the Illinois Plan, which is actually in place and operative since 1979, is given, followed by a synopsis of the tentative state plan for New York that would implement the recommendations of the President's Commission on a large scale, and a brief description of other state and district-level initiatives. Some of the real-world constraints and realities that exist on the state and local level are then discussed, some of which can create significant barriers to the realization of proposed programs. A third section of the Report is devoted to the description of some of the local and district-wide programs that have been initiated across the country in response to the President's Commission and which have been successful in reconciling, at least to some extent, the vision of improved foreign language and global education programs with the realities facing the profession in

the 1980s. A final section presents some conclusions and recommendations based on the information contained in the body of the Report, followed by an appendix of resource persons and references.

State-Level Leadership for Foreign Language and International Studies: The Illinois Plan

One of the first major state initiatives to improve and expand the teaching of foreign language and international studies was undertaken in 1978, when the Illinois State Board of Education launched a comprehensive state-wide program. This initiative immediately won the support of professional organizations and institutions of higher education, and it has since earned the backing of teachers, administrators, parents, students, and many community groups. Since its inception, the Illinois Plan had developed into a vigorous movement that has already produced noteworthy results, some of which are summarized in this section.

The first major step of the movement in Illinois was taken in October 1978, when the State Superintendent of Education appointed the Illinois Task Force on Language and International Studies. By June 1979, the Task Force had submitted its report, which the State Board staff developed into the Illinois Plan for Language and International Studies, and implementation of the Task Force recommendations began. It is significant to note that although this stage was reached six months prior to the publication of the report of the President's Commission, the Illinois Plan has been thoroughly consistent with the mounting national effort that has ensued.

The Illinois Plan strongly emphasizes the importance of language and international studies for *all* students, kindergarten through university. The Plan is decidedly interdisciplinary. It is also characterized by the widest possible participation of both academic and community groups. The leadership provided by the State Board has been dual in nature: the state office has conducted many of the activities on its own; at the same time, the office has placed a high priority on supporting the efforts of other organizations, encouraging collaborative projects with and among other interested groups, and in general fostering leadership and initiatives from a wide range of sources. Much of the success of the movement in Illinois can be attributed to this collaborative philosophy of the state office with its emphasis on resource linkage, coalition building, and facilitation of the efforts of a great variety of individuals and groups.

The Illinois Plan provides for the completion of approximately fifty major activities over the five-year period 1980-85. A general impression of the efforts under way can be had from the following summary of major activities:

STATE AND REGIONAL ADVISORY COUNCILS

Five regional advisory councils and one state advisory council were appointed by the State Superintendent in September 1980. The achievements of these councils include inservice programs, awareness conferences, special university courses, needs assessments, resource identification activities, and assistance to the State Board staff in setting its priorities. Four initiatives of the advisory councils have evolved into distinct entities: two regional teacher centers, one at Illinois State University in Normal and

the other at Highland Community College in Freeport; the Consortium for Language and International Studies, which has as a major goal the creation of a summer program to help smooth the transition of high school students into university programs; and the Language and International Studies Network, which is discussed fully later in this section.

COOPERATING CONSULTANTS

The State Board has identified and prepared sixty outside consultants to provide assistance to local schools in language and international studies, usually at no cost to the districts.

INSERVICE PROGRAMS

Since September 1980, the State Board has offered six awareness conferences and twenty-four workshops to enhance language and international studies programs. The audiences included students, administrators, and community persons, as well as teachers of various subjects and grade levels. In addition, the state office has conducted six planning seminars to assist leadership teams from local communities in developing individualized plans to improve and expand their language and international programs. Follow-up consultative services were provided by the State Board to assist the districts in further refining and implementing their local plans. Thirty-eight communities are currently participating in this program.

LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES SCHOOLS

In December 1980, the State Board collaborated with the Curriculum Laboratory of the University of Illinois in organizing and conducting the National Seminar on the Implementation of International Schools. With financial assistance from Exxon, sixty leaders from all over the nation and representing a number of disciplines, professional groups, and agencies met in Urbana to develop a blueprint for a type of secondary school whose curriculum would be highly internationalized and in which students would study at least one major and one minor language. The *Proceedings* of this seminar have provided the basis for a quantity of follow-up studies and the creation of actual curricular programs in many parts of the nation.

In Illinois, three programs are currently being implemented following the Urbana model: The Glenbrook Academy of International Studies in Glenview and Northbrook opened its doors to its first class in September 1981; and planning is in progress to create similar schools at Morgan Park High School in Chicago and at University High School in Urbana. It should be emphasized that these schools represent a degree of innovation comparable to that of the performing arts schools found in some larger U.S. cities. (See also *The International High School* below.)

SCHOOL RESOURCE SITES

Thirty-five additional schools are implementing various other kinds of language and international studies programs in collaboration with the state office. These schools serve as resource sites to other schools in the state.

LANGUAGE AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES NETWORK (LISN)

In January 1982, delegates from the State Board, the Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association, the Advisory Council for Language and International Studies, and the Illinois School Resource Sites met with representatives of the International Business Council Mid-America to explore possibilities for resource sharing. This

initiative blossomed into the Language and International Studies Network (LISN), a forum for discussions and a clearinghouse for exchanging resources between the academic and business communities. For schools, LISN will organize a speakers bureau, internships in international businesses, and seminars for guidance counselors; for business, awareness programs as well as language and cross-cultural training programs are envisioned. At first LISN will focus on Illinois needs, but the Network will eventually offer its services nationwide.

COOPERATIVE PROJECTS WITH PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

In October 1981, at the suggestion of the State Board staff, the Illinois Foreign Language Teachers Association (IFLTA) and the Illinois Council for the Social Studies held a joint annual statewide conference with the theme of global perspectives. More recently, IFLTA, with assistance from the State Board, received federal funding to conduct a curriculum development project on Mexican culture. As a result, sixteen Illinois teachers of foreign language and social studies traveled to Mexico for six weeks in July-August 1982, to create instructional units, to be disseminated by the State Board, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), and Global Perspectives in Education. In 1982-83, sixty Illinois college teachers will be trained to conduct and rate Oral Proficiency Interviews under a federal grant awarded to IFLTA in cooperation with the State Board of Education, ACTFL, and the Council of West Suburban Colleges.

OTHER STATE OFFICE LEADERSHIP

In addition to creating the Illinois Task Force and the Illinois Plan, the State Board has issued a strong policy statement in favor of language and international studies. The Board has also obtained a grant from the U.S. Department of Education to implement many activities under the Plan.

MISCELLANEOUS

The State Board is working with the staff of Hall Township High School in Spring Valley on the possibility of teaching units using video programs received on the district's own equipment from international communications satellites. The Board is also engaged in a curriculum development effort with the U.S. Olympics Committee. The Board also provides major links in the ACTFL Alert Network and the ACTFL Public Awareness Network. State Board staff members have also furnished consultative services to several institutions of higher learning in their efforts to internationalize their curricula. Other projects in progress in the state in which the State Board plays no major role, but which contribute to the high level of activity in language and international studies development include the Chicago Language Academies and the George Williams College immersion weekends.

A condensed summary such as this can by no means do justice to the activities in Illinois, not to mention the many important ancillary programs and the dedication of the workers involved. Therefore, the reader is referred to the resource persons listed in the Appendix for additional information.

Education for a Global Perspective: A Plan for New York State

The tentative Plan[3] for New York State: Education for a Global Perspective, with its emphasis on foreign language instruction and multi-cultural perspectives, is a second major example of a state initiative to respond to the President's Commission recommendations. The Plan's rationale focuses on economic issues and technological innovations and on social, environmental, and political complexities which demonstrate once again the interdependence of nations.

The Plan for Education for a Global Perspective aims at two fundamental changes in New York's educational program. First, the plan requires schools and educational agencies to incorporate into the instructional program content and skills related to the multicultural society. Second, it aims to prepare a multilingual population, with individuals able to communicate in English and at least one other language.

GOAL

The goal of this plan is to develop among all students a knowledge and understanding of the cultures of this nation and the world on the one hand, and on the other hand to provide them with communication skills necessary to meet their personal and professional objectives in cultural settings and in languages other than their own.

OBJECTIVES

Some of the major objectives of the New York Plan are highlighted below:

(1) As a condition for receiving a high school diploma, students will demonstrate an understanding of the interaction among their own and other cultures in an era of change, diversity, and conflicts; and an understanding of the world as a network of interdependent cultural, social, economic, political and environmental systems.

(2) As a condition for receiving a high school diploma, students will demonstrate that they have acquired knowledge of cultures other than their own and the skills for studying another culture's values, beliefs, and attitudes without prejudgement or precondition.

(3) Local schools will begin programs of elementary school instruction in a foreign language leading to a basic functional proficiency at the end of grade six. A final plan will incorporate one of three options to assure proficiency: a sixth grade statewide test; specific requirements for student exposure to foreign language instruction; or a strong encouragement by the State to local districts.

(4) By 1996, more than 50% of all high school graduates will possess a functional communicative ability in a language other than English, and such proficiency will be shared among both academic students and graduates of occupational educational programs. Starting with grade seven, students will have the opportunity (a) to expand and refine a second language proficiency gained in elementary language learning sequences for potential application to career or other personal goals, or (b) to develop proficiency in a second foreign language, or (c) to acquire a working knowledge of a classical language, or (d) to

learn subject-matter content in languages other than English.

Some of the needs generated by the Plan include the following:

(1) A sufficient number of qualified elementary school teachers will be necessary to instruct in a second language as well as in English.
(2) Higher education institutions will have to prepare a larger number of teachers who can instruct presently neglected languages, such as Japanese, Chinese, and Arabic.
(3) Public libraries, television, and radio will have to expand their multilingual, multicultural offerings.
(4) Higher education and cultural institutions will have to expand resources to keep adults aware of worldwide conditions and events.

Various factors may militate against unconditional adoption of the New York State Plan, as outlined above, by the state legislature. One major factor is the fact that the public schools of New York State are confronted with a myriad of mandates already imposed on them by Federal and State agencies (although the Federal control will be less intense for the next few years). These mandates include regulations, laws, and rules in the areas of instruction, curriculum, transportation, personnel, finance, and facilities. When the possibility of another mandate in public education is discussed, a number of factors, including the value of other possible areas of study in the schools, length of the school day, number of periods, number of school days in a school year, must also be reviewed, to say nothing of the added expense of equipment, materials, and personnel.

Aside from the fiscal and time constraints, there is a number of other inhibitors to the acceptance of such a plan, especially in public attitudes toward global education. A tradition of self-sufficiency in American culture has led to the rejection of experiences of others, especially in industry, commerce, agriculture, military power, and religious and educational institutions. In addition, there is a tradition of acculturation of immigrants, in which those who have immigrated have been expected to learn "American" language and customs as quickly as possible, and even to reject their own traditions and tongues. A third inhibitor to the acceptance of the Plan is a fear of world government: that is, some Americans are afraid that the term "global perspective" or "global education" might lead to the subjugation of our national interests or to "one-worldism." This fear is manifested, for example, in slogans decrying the United Nations or similar world councils and cooperative associations.

There are additional constraints expressed among educators, even those who are supportive of the infusion of global perspectives into all levels of education, that constitute possible impediments to change. For a discussion of these issues, see *Recognizing the Realities* below.

Other State and Local Initiatives

Several other states have been active in implementing recommendations of the President's Commission by conducting studies on the need for and interest in foreign language and international studies among their citizens. Some of the highlights of such activities, reported in recent issues of the ACTFL *Public Awareness Newsletter*,[4] are summarized below.

OREGON

On July 28, 1980, Governor Victor Atiyeh signed an executive order creating the Governor's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, consisting of representatives of business, industry, local school boards, and various school systems. Six task force committees have been organized and meet regularly to accomplish various goals, which include (1) establishing a computerized inventory of state resources pertaining to foreign language and international studies, (2) eliciting information from Oregon businesses concerning needs and employment opportunities for those possessing foreign language and international skills, (3) studying Oregon's global education requirement in the schools, (4) determining who should study foreign languages and how their progress should be assessed, and (5) raising the international consciousness of teachers through inservice education.

OKLAHOMA

The Oklahoma Task Force on Foreign Language Education has recommended that (1) the State Board should advertise the benefits of foreign language study and launch a public awareness campaign, (2) the Board should monitor the progress of foreign language study via an Advisory Committee, (3) each Oklahoma high school should be mandated to offer foreign language instruction, and (4) the state should consider pilot testing an international high school. Recommendations have also been made to initiate 30 new foreign language programs over a three-year period and provide funds for inservice teacher education to upgrade skills in all languages.

OHIO

The Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association has sponsored many activities statewide that have attracted the attention of the state superintendent, who appointed in February 1982 a twelve-member Task Force on Foreign Language and International Studies. This is one example of the potential influence that a professional organization can have on decision-making at the state level.

LOUISIANA

The Louisiana State Commission on French as a Second Language is polling public opinion to determine if the citizens of the state would support a requirement that French be offered at all levels of the public school system. A series of hearings have indicated strong support from the French community, as well as representatives of multinational businesses, elementary and secondary schools, and universities. The present law in Louisiana states that if 25% of the parents in a district petition for foreign language instruction, the schools are obligated to provide it. One half of the school districts in the state currently provide French instruction for 30 minutes a day beginning in the first grade.

MARYLAND

Baltimore is the first city in the United States to require all sixth, seventh, and eighth graders in the public schools to study either French or Spanish, beginning in September of 1982. The Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners approved the requirement unanimously as one step in a larger plan to extend foreign language study to grades four through eight and include a four-year high school language requirement for all students planning to enter college.

ELSEWHERE

Many other states are involved in awareness conferences and related public relations activities, as well as cooperative exchange programs for foreign language teachers with members of the business communities. There is little doubt that activity to foster growth in language programs is spreading, in spite of the real constraints and limitations that exist. Some of the problems facing the profession are discussed in the next section, as well as other realities that must be considered as we seek to improve the status and quality of language and global education programs in the years ahead.

Recognizing the Realities

Although the decade of the 80s promises, in general, to be a period of renewal and growth in foreign language programs, there are outside factors that continue to challenge the ingenuity and resourcefulness of foreign language teachers. Some of the more significant of these factors are analyzed briefly in this section of the Report. Although many of these same factors were described by Brannon and Cox in 1976,[5] the fiscal crisis and the crisis of confidence have intensified somewhat in the public schools in the last five years.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS AND BUDGET CUTS

In spite of a renewed recognition of the importance of foreign language competence in modern society, programs have been curtailed in many parts of the country for financial reasons. In some cases, teachers who have expended great effort over a period of years to build their foreign language offerings find their program reduced or eliminated as school boards seek ways to achieve a balanced budget.

With decreased general enrollment and continuing taxpayers' revolts, school systems are forced each year to redefine the essentials as they see them. Often, instructional materials have to be sacrificed in order to retain personnel. It is often this lack of effective current instructional materials — tapes of foreign television and radio broadcasts, non-print media, current magazines, recent newspapers, and other realia, as well as current textbooks — that inhibit the development of better foreign language and global education programs in the schools. Under such adverse circumstances, the resourcefulness and creativity of teachers must come into play to adapt existing materials and textbooks to suit perceived needs as much as possible.

If reductions in staffing must occur in a given school, a foreign language teacher whose preparation does not include a second foreign language is often among the most vulnerable faculty members. Although foreign language teaching is by nature interdisciplinary, it is only in recent years that many foreign language staff members have been drawn so consistently into the mainstream of the school through teaching assignments in other disciplines. In many secondary schools, in fact, a one-language assignment is a "luxury" of the past. In Prince George's County Maryland, for example, foreign language teachers with preparation in only one language are no longer employed, except in emergency situations. In addition to teaching a second foreign language, a schedule that includes English, social studies, or math is not uncommon in many areas in the country.

Perhaps the most overwhelming concern for administrators and teachers in the

light of the 'budget crunch" has been the declining enrollments in the secondary schools, which can result in a number of distressing calamities, such as greatly reduced or inadequate budgets for materials, combined-level classes, and even combined-language classes. Creative and effective ways to adjust to these situations must be found if programs are to survive and grow in the years to come.

CONSERVATISM AND RETURN TO THE "BASICS"

The lack of flexibility in the curriculum has often resulted from the real or imagined societal pressures to emphasize "the basics," defined in the narrowest sense as reading, written and oral communication, and mathematics. The energy devoted toward building those "basics" has drained resources and, in some cases, intensified the stress on traditional isolationist educational views. The dangers in this trend are serious as schools narrow their curricular focus, and as the nation turns inward despite the reality of a shrinking globe.

On the positive side, however, educators in other fields and some portions of the public at large are increasingly recognizing the role of foreign language study in enlarging students' horizons both linguistically and culturally. Those of us in the language teaching profession should not miss the opportunity to reinforce those points of view supportive of foreign language and global education programs as part of a basic education. There are many other curricular areas competing for the same consideration, however, and sound arguments will need to be advanced by foreign language educators to win support for maintenance and improvement of language and global education programs in the future.

GAPS IN TEACHER EDUCATION AND TEACHER BURN-OUT

A third "reality" that must be dealt with in any discussion of language education today is that of teacher education and morale. Foreign language teachers are probably among the best prepared teachers in the schools today, but some are most definitely suffering from apathy and "burn-out." These characteristics seem to be common to a number of teachers across the curriculum, and may be due to salaries that cannot keep up with inflation, working conditions that are difficult to manage (such as cafeteria or bus duties), large class sizes (over 35 students), overburdened curricula, apathetic students, demanding parents, and administrators and guidance counselors who seem to "undermine the foreign language program." Furthermore, professional training in the first three-quarters of the twentieth century, when many high school teachers received their degrees, did not include the type of offerings that would prepare teachers for the reality of rapid change. The orientation of language and social studies teachers is probably best suited to responding to the challenges of the global education movement, but more refinement of skills is required, in terms of knowledge of the content of instruction, the organization of that content, the development of materials, and the teaching processes needed to achieve global education goals.

Many language teachers attempt to deal systematically with their professional development needs by attending conferences and reading professional publications, evaluating their own performance periodically, taking courses to refine their skills, designing their own new programs, travelling abroad to refine language and cultural skills, and engaging in other professional development activities. More such opportunities need to be provided for teachers, as well as necessary released time to engage in these self-improvement endeavors, so that appropriate retraining and retooling can be

accomplished as conveniently as possible in the coming years. Needless to say, the expense of such training will have to be kept to a minimum if teachers are to benefit realistically from in-service programs. The cost of attending even one professional conference per year can be prohibitive for many secondary school teachers, unless they can obtain partial or full support from outside sources.

ARTICULATION

When students of differing proficiency levels arrive in the same class from a variety of lower-level courses, problems often ensue that almost defy solution. The problems of articulation between levels of instruction and between schools have existed for many years, and a wide variety of solutions have been proposed. The profession must address this issue in some organized and definitive manner in the coming years, especially if longer sequences of language instruction are successfully instituted.

One very promising solution to the problem of articulation, as well as to a myriad of other related problems, is the development of a common metric on a national scale for foreign language proficiency. ACTFL and the Educational Testing Service (ETS) are currently engaged in developing generic and language-specific linguistic and cultural proficiency descriptions that will enable teachers to place any given student's current proficiency on a commonly understood scale ranging from 0 to 5 (novice to native speaker).[6] If these descriptions gain acceptance as a common metric for foreign language proficiency and cultural understanding, many of the problems of articulation will be solved. Students can be immediately matched to courses via such proficiency ratings, regardless of the school or language sequence from which they came. These same proficiency standards can be used to generate guidelines for state and local curricular offerings, assuring a certain commonality of purpose in similar language programs across the country. It is clear that such a step is necessary if we are to solve our perennial problems in this domain.

Realizing the Dream: Some Beginnings

In spite of the problems discussed in the preceding pages, school districts across the nation are supporting more and more innovative foreign language programs in their schools and providing new opportunities and experiences for secondary school students that are attracting greater numbers to the language classroom. Curricular materials and teaching methodologies are beginning to reflect more directly the goals of communicative and meaningful language learning that have been the focus of interest in the professional literature over the past decade. Exploratory course offerings, exchange programs, global studies, and computer-assisted instruction are becoming more and more widespread. Other innovations, such as international high schools and programs leading to an international baccalaureate degree, are also being considered by an increasing number of districts and schools. It is noteworthy that many of these programs were begun long before the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies was even conceived.

In the sections that follow, the philosophical underpinnings of such programs are highlighted, and several examples of programs that are enjoying success are given. Such programs will hopefully serve as catalysts or models for other school districts.

EXPLORATORY COURSES

Foreign language educators have long supported an early start in foreign language study. The exploratory foreign language course is one way to provide students with that early beginning. Many schools are offering exploratory courses in grades six, seven, or eight as a means of adding momentum and visibility to their language programs. The general goals of an exploratory course may include but are not limited to the following:

(1) to establish a basis for developing a high degree of proficiency in a given language;
(2) to generate interest in and receptivity to studying a second language;
(3) to sensitize students to the rationale for studying a language;
(4) to dispel fears or misconceptions about foreign languages;
(5) to make language study available to a greater number of students;
(6) to aid students in making a better informed decision about which language sequence they wish to pursue.

Exploratory courses should ideally combine learnings relating to the way languages work in general as well as the way a sampling of languages work in particular. Some specific cognitive, psychomotor, and affective goals of such courses might include the following:

(1) Cognitive/Psychomotor Goals
- exploring the nature and history of language
- the acquisition of some limited skills in a few specific languages
- awareness of the influence of other languages on the English language
- awareness of specific cultures and cultural influences within the United States, as well as in other countries of the world
- awareness of the language learning *process*
- awareness of the role of languages in the world of work.

(2) Affective Goals
- positive attitudes toward other cultures
- positive attitudes toward language study
- appreciation of the richness of national heritage due to the influence of other languages and cultures
- awareness of the enhancement of one's career potential due to language study.

While there is a similarity in purpose in the exploratory courses offered in schools across the nation, each bears its own hallmark in its attempt to meet the needs of its student population and increase and maintain enrollment in the extended language sequence. The short description of a sampling of exploratory courses below will provide some insight into the similarities and differences that currently exist.

Case Studies. The students in grade eight in the Millard School District in Omaha, Nebraska, are introduced to the sounds and basic vocabulary of French, German, and Spanish in an exploratory course called "Foreign Language Survey." The students also become acquainted with the geography and culture of the target countries. The course is taught by three teachers, each of whom offers a twelve-week session. The staff feels that as a result of the basic introduction the students receive to the sound system of each language, classroom instruction is greatly facilitated in grade nine. In addi-

tion, more students opt to begin language study in grade nine.[7]

Brattleboro (Vt.) Union High School, which encompasses grades 7-12 and is the single high school serving that Union School District, offers a unique seventh-grade elective communications class. In this course, students are exposed to language, art, music, dance, and body language as manifestations of human communication. One month of study each is given to French, German, and Spanish. Many world languages are presented, as is a unit on Sign language. Another unique feature of this program is that student teacher-aides, who are advanced students of French, German, and Spanish, assist the respective staff members in teaching the course. These advanced students take a one-semester course for credit in teaching strategies for communication.[8]

An overview of language as a cultural and linguistic phenomenon is offered to seventh-grade students at the Harvard School in North Hollywood, California, in a course entitled "The Phenomenon of Language."

> The purpose of this exploratory course is to give students a background in language as an intellectual, cultural, and historical phenomenon, in order to sensitize them to both the exigencies and the benefits of language study. Not only do the teachers wish to create in their students a receptivity for languages, but they also hope to instill an awareness of how Indo-European language systems are related to one another. The staff sets this process in motion by exposing the students to an intensive, 17-week introduction to Latin.[9]

French, Spanish, and Russian are explored by the students in four-week sessions following the introduction in Latin. The course culminates with an informal examination of comparative linguistics.

"The Phenomenon of Language" course achieved such success that the course material has been published by the Independent School Press in Boston. Also, a plan to integrate mini-courses in linguistics into the curriculum of the regular four-year language sequence has been approved by the school's administration.[10]

The exploratory course offered in the Lower Moreland School District in Huntington Valley, Pennsylvania, is designed to help students make a more informed choice in deciding which language to study in a longer sequence. The exploratory course is required in grade six or seven and is divided into three twelve-week segments. French, German, and Spanish are offered. Each twelve-week segment is subdivided to include seven weeks of cultural study and five weeks of an introduction to each language.[11]

EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

The 1981 *Northeast Conference Reports*[12] dedicated a chapter to "Exchange and Travel Abroad in Secondary Schools"[13] as an integral part of its theme *Foreign Languages and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration*. The exchange program is one of the most exciting ways for students to put to practical use their years of studying a foreign language. More than ever before, secondary school students need to feel that they can put the subjects they are studying to meaningful use outside the classroom context.

Throughout the years many students have had the opportunity to go abroad either through short-term programs over vacation periods of through long-term exchanges during the school year. Many of the exchanges are reciprocal, thus giving the American schools the opportunity to have foreign students in their schools and communi-

ties. In keeping with the trend toward global education, secondary schools should encourage and develop exchange programs that are indeed reciprocal. Many of the programs have started as a result of the initiatives of individual foreign language teachers who had personal contacts with teachers and schools abroad. Teachers who do not have these contacts may use the services of the many associations that offer exchange programs at the secondary school level. (See Appendix.)

Travel abroad is without a doubt a prescription for success for the secondary school foreign language program. Long after the exchange is over, students continue to profit from the experience.

Case Studies. The most effective component of the foreign language program in the Parkway School District in Chesterfield, Missouri, is the diversified travel and exchange program it offers to the students. The district has thirteen programs with France, Canada, Germany, Spain, and Mexico. These programs involve approximately 450 students each year and bring to the school district a great number of foreign students.

Most of the Parkway programs have homestays of two to four weeks. Students must be currently involved in foreign language study in order to participate. Many of the upper-level language courses have seen an increase in enrollment as a result of the exchange program. It has also affected the community's perception of the language program and secured strong community support for foreign languages.[14]

Brattleboro (Vt.) Union High School has three-week homestay exchange programs with Germany, Mexico, Spain, and Switzerland. The teachers at Brattleboro provide the students with an intensive semester-long orientation on the culture of the host country. Pre-exchange orientation is most important if the students are to derive maximum benefit both culturally and linguistically from the exchange experience. Brattleboro Union High School also has the advantage of being located near the School for International Training, home of The Experiment in International Living whose members often visit classes and talk with the students about various aspects of culture and language.[15]

Xavier High School, a Jesuit school in New York City, also values foreign study as a means to achieve foreign language proficiency. The school has an international exchange program that enables students to spend five to eight weeks at Jesuit secondary schools in France, Germany, and Italy.[16]

There are many exchange programs on the secondary level throughout the country. The main objectives include (1) giving students the chance to practice the language skills acquired in the United States, (2) providing an immersion experiece in both the language and the culture of the foreign country, and (3) providing the opportunity to build cross-cultural understanding and a sense of the interdependence of nations. Exchange programs have incited a tremendous amount of interest among students, administrators, and parents. Enrollments in foreign language classes have increased due to these programs.

THE INTERNATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL

> The Commission recommends federal funding to develop 20 Language and International Studies High Schools, using already existing regional high schools, to serve as models nationally and to offer intensive foreign language and cultural studies to students in the country's more populated regions and also in less urban

areas. The establishment of up to 60 such high schools (one per metropolitan district) should be a long-term goal.

In addition to all regularly required courses, the Language and International Studies High Schools should offer intensive language teaching in the less commonly as well as commonly taught languages. All students enrolled in these schools should be required to achieve advanced competence in at least one additional language. The schools should integrate language and cultural teaching.[17]

This excerpt from *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capabilities* describes an educational concept that was put into practice in 1966 with the creation of the Washington (D.C.) International School. The school opened its doors over a decade and a half ago with the goal of making its students bilingual through the use of the pool of international teaching talent that was available in the area to enrich the cultural and educational lives of Washington children. Its students are the children of the international civil servant as well as those who have always resided in the nation's capital.

The Washington International School comprises prekindergarten through grade twelve. It is divided into three "houses": Junior House, a half-day nursery (age 3) through Junior 5 (age 10); a Middle House, Middle 1 through 3 (ages 11-13); and a Tutorial House, Tutorial 1 through 4 (ages 14-17). From the very beginning in the primary grades, pupils are required to pursue their regular school subjects through two working languages — English and French or Spanish. Bilingualism or multilingualism are realistic, attainable goals that underlie the educational program. Latin is required in the Middle House for at least two years.

Goodman and Scott cite several criteria that should be incorporated into a genuinely international school:

(1) the teaching staff should be of several nationalities;
(2) the children should also be of many nationalities, including the privileged and the underprivileged of the host community;
(3) each child should use at least two working languages;
(4) the syllabuses should accomodate at least two national traditions;
(5) the textbooks and teaching materials should come from several countries;
(6) the school should prepare its students for post-secondary education in more than one country.[18]

In addition to the intensive language training that the students receive in two languages, they also pursue a strenuous sequence in the sciences and mathematics. The staff does not advocate "international studies" for their social studies curriculum but rather believes strongly in the study of history and geography. Hence, regional geography (Asia, the Americas, Europe, and Africa) are studied successively between ages eleven and thirteen. Physical geography and human geography on a worldwide basis are studied in Tutorial 1 and 2. Thereafter, in Tutorial 3 and 4 the International Baccalaureate syllabuses in contemporary history are followed. The total curriculum and syllabuses of the International Baccalaureate Program are used in the students' last two years at the school.

Goodman and Scott suggest steps for beginning an International High School such as the one in Washington. Initially, they include the following:

(1) joining the International Baccalaureate Program;

(2) tightening graduation requirements;
(3) joining the self-instructional program at Temple University in Philadelphia designed to help colleges and high schools choose materials for self-instruction in the "critical" languages;
(4) building on the linguistic strengths of the junior high schools and the community; and
(5) sending for the Washington International School history syllabuses.

In addition to these immediate short-term steps, they also make some medium and long-term (five to ten years) suggestions:

(1) introducing a course in philology;
(2) ensuring the systematic continuance at the secondary school level of those languages begun in the elementary and junior high schools;
(3) requiring at least two years of a classical language;
(4) requiring a full three years of a modern language or two years of two modern languages;
(5) requiring that there be readings through other languages in advanced history courses;
(6) requiring geography throughout the high school; and
(7) offering at least one complete course through another language.

The long-term suggestions deal with offering one classical language in addition to Latin or Greek, such as Mandarin Chinese, Arabic, or Sanskrit, and offering two or three "critical" languages such as Russian, Japanese, or Swahili for at least three years each.[19]

Other models for international high schools have been proposed by the University of Illinois in cooperation with the Illinois State Board of Education and CEMREL.[20] The education to be provided in such schools would include foreign languages, humanities, social sciences, mathematics, and physical education, all of which are rooted in an international cross-cultural perspective. One of the first issues that needs to be resolved is whether the curriculum should be such that students study a particular language group and geo-political area in depth, or whether they acquire an understanding of global history and culture, i.e., a more general education. "Much can be said in praise of both; much can be said of the dangers of each. The one can lead to tunnel vision; the other can lead to superficiality."[21]

These and other issues are the subject of much discussion in Illinois as planning conferences for international high schools are held. Three models of the curriculum for international high schools have been outlined in the Illinois report cited earlier. These models are summarized below.[22]

The Curriculum in a General Magnet Program. This curriculum could be the curriculum of a single school or that of a "school within a school."

Graduation Requirements (4 years). To obtain a high school diploma, students in the international high school would complete the following curriculum:

Foreign Language A	4 years	including history, literature, and other aspects of culture
Foreign Language B	2 years	
Mathematics	4 years	including algebra, geometry, and pre-calculus with units on computing and

		on statistics
English	4 years	including comparative folklore and comparative literature, language, semantics, rhetoric
Science	3 years	including an introduction to technology and applied science and to ecology and natural resources
Social Science	4 years	including U.S. and World history, economics, geography, comparative government
Cultural Aesthetics	2 years	including comparative studies and history
Physical Education	4 years	including study of games, culture and sport and experience of playing sports of other cultures

Other courses as defined by state or local law.

An Immersion Approach to the Curriculum. A second approach to an international high school would be through the use of the foreign language as a medium of instruction throughout the curriculum. The advantages of such an approach are many, but include the very important advantage of using the language for purposeful communication. The Washington International School described earlier is one example of a school along this model.

The Curriculum for a Consortium of Rural Schools. Because, in many instances, a single school can neither become an International School or provide such a curriculum in and of itself, a group of co[illegible]ous schools might offer a composite program of offerings that would provide the same type of education as an International High School elsewhere. This model might be especially useful for small schools or for rural areas. Such a program might include a one or two-year intensive program in a foreign language at one of the schools in the consortium, with another parallel program in a different language at a second school in the group. Summer or Saturday courses could be given in the area, each covering material discussed in the first model above under subject matter headings such as math, science, English, art, and the like. A consortium of rural schools might capitalize on an area vocational center or on a centrally-located community college as a site for common experience.

THE INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM

At this writing, some sixty public and private schools in the United States and Canada are providing challenging and motivating programs for their academically talented students through the International Baccalaureate Program. The IB is a system of syllabuses and examinations in the major academic subjects that are traditionally studied in the students' last two years of high school. Successful achievement in the program leads to a diploma that is recognized by universities throughout the world for the purpose of admission, course credit or advanced standing, or advanced placement without credit.

The IB curriculum was designed by an international group of educators. It requires that students pursuing the IB program become proficient in what they consider "the

two most important tools of communication and analysis" — language and mathematics. Syllabuses and examinations are provided by the IB program in six areas. They are:

(1) **Language A and its literature.** This is usually the native language of the student or of the country where the school is situated. World literature is studied through the student's Language A.
(2) **Language B.** This is a second language and its literature. Latin may be offered as a Language B with the special permission of the IBO in Geneva.
(3) **"Study of Man":** history, geography, economics, philosophy, psychology, social anthropology, or business studies.
(4) **Mathematics.**
(5) **An experimental science.**
(6) **An optional subject** from fields such as the plastic arts, music, a classical language, a second Language B, a subject from the areas of mathematics, experimental science, or the "study of man", or computer studies.[23]

Students choose major and minor areas of study and are examined in that context at Higher and Subsidiary Level. Another requirement of the IB program is a course designed by IB on the theory of knowledge and some independent time spent in a creative or aesthetic experience, or in community service.

The International Baccalaureate program concentrates more on the philosophy of learning and learning skills than on the straightforward acquisition of knowledge. Hence the IB program is easily adapted by most schools. There is considerable latitude given to the schools in adapting the curriculum to comply with the requirements of the IB curriculum and to achieve the high standards established for the IB examinations.

A Swiss foundation, the International Baccalaureate Program, is sponsored and administered by the International Baccalaureate Office in Geneva. In the United States and Canada the IBO is represented by International Baccalaureate North America, Inc., which is a tax-exempt, publicly supported corporation chartered in New York. (See Appendix).

GLOBAL EDUCATION/INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Just as the terms "international school," "international studies," and "international education" mean different things to different people, the term "global education" is equally difficult to define precisely. For some it is synonymous with "international studies" or the study of another culture and the relationship between the two countries. For others it includes but goes beyond the study of another language and its culture. Global education transcends the disciplinary boundaries of social studies and foreign language to encompass all subject areas.[24]

Case Study. Hillcrest High School in Jamaica, New York, has a School of International Studies (SIS) that is an interdisciplinary program integrating the study of English, foreign language, and social studies for three periods each day.[25] During the students' junior and senior years they embark on an imaginary world tour. At each destination, the history, politics, economics, literature, art, music, and religion of the region are studied as well as an introduction to its language. The program is geared

for college-bound and career-oriented students and provides an excellent background in the areas of world trade, travel and tourism, and the foreign service. Students who complete the SIS program, which includes a second-year internship or independent study project, receive a special SIS endorsement on their high school diplomas.

The SIS has taken certain elements of history, culture, and social currents that have traditionally been taught as separate disciplines and combined them into a single correlated curriculum. For example, the study of 19th century Russia integrates the history of the Napoleonic invasion with a reading of substantial portions of *War and Peace* and an analysis of Tchaikovsky's "1812 Overture." Russian phrases that will help the students as "tourists" on this world tour will also be taught. SIS students are required to study either four years of one foreign language or five years of two foreign languages in addition to their regular courses within the program.[26]

COMPUTER-ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

In addition to curricular innovations such as those described in the preceding pages, significant changes are occurring in foreign language instruction with the advance of technological aids, such as computers and microcomputers. The high cost of computer-assisted instruction had, for a while, limited its use to the post-secondary level. In 1979, the National Association of Secondary School Principals projected that within the next few years most secondary schools would own at least one microcomputer. Decreasing costs have gradually brought the microcomputer within reach of many schools, with the result that such equipment can now be found in most secondary schools across the nation. While computers and microcomputers may be more evident in the mathematics department, they are accessible to foreign language teachers and are being used with more and more frequency in foreign language programs.

Some individual teachers have purchased their own equipment and are designing programs for use in their classes. There has even been the case of students raising the money needed to purchase a microcomputer at Cupertino High School in Cupertino, California.[27]

Foreign language professional organizations have also provided some inservice training in the use of computers and microcomputers. During the past three years nearly every major foreign language conference throughout the country has had one or more panels or workshops on the use of computers in the foreign language classroom. Brigham Young University has been among those instrumental in developing and promoting the use of computers and microcomputers in foreign language instruction as well as the more recent addition to the world of educational technology, the videodisc. The Society for Microcomputer Applications in Language and Literature (SMALL) was created in 1980 through the efforts of Professor Wendell Hall at Brigham Young. Among the activities of this organization is the publication of a newsletter that contains many interesting articles related to foreign languages and microcomputers.

The potential of the application of this technology has not yet been realized. Many teachers are currently developing their own software (see Appendix). However, their efforts in this area have not been publicized sufficiently for the remainder of the profession to be aware of their successes. Hopefully, this will change in the very near future.

Case Studies. The staff and students at Cupertino (Calif.) High School have developed a microcomputer component for the German program. A number of vocabulary and grammar drill programs has been developed, as well as programs providing cultural enrichment in German. The programs provide assistance for the slow, average, and above-average student. A talented student can complete two years of German in one by using the accelerated program on the microcomputer four times per week either after school or during lunch. The students at Cupertino High School raised almost all of the funds needed to purchase this equipment. The computer-assisted instruction program has brought great flexibility to the German curriculum while increasing enrollment in the course.[28]

Students in the Baltimore City Public Schools are using PLATO terminals to communicate with other students in Canada, Belgium, and Holland. In another Maryland school district, Prince George's County, teachers have prepared more than one hundred computer programs that are coordinated with their basic textbooks used in five languages. Students themselves are programming foreign language computer activities because of their expertise which results from experience with computers in mathematics and science. A program on computer literacy and languages has been created and implemented in the seventh-grade exploratory course in foreign languages.[29]

Some Conclusions and Recommendations

The state, district, and local initiatives described in this Report are representative of the types of efforts that are going on across the nation to assure continued growth in foreign language and global education programs in the decades ahead. It is clear that there are several avenues for achieving continued success and encouraging the improvement of foreign language and global education. One approach, as exemplified by the New York Plan, is to mandate that students must demonstrate competence in at least one foreign language by the time they complete their secondary school education: the use of a common metric, such as that being developed by the ACTFL-ETS proficiency projects, will be essential for determining that level of competence.

A second approach, as exemplified by the Illinois Plan, would be through the active support by state and national organizations and state boards of education of grass-roots movements to improve instruction on the local level. This latter approach is appealing, since the best of plans can only come to fruition with the help of the individual teachers in the classroom. It is clear that the "grass roots" interest is there, and the programs described in the third section of this report are evidence of that interest and enthusiasm.

But the sample of successful programs we have described is only a beginning. If we are to achieve the goals set forth in the first pages of this Report, we will have to make a concerted effort to work together effectively as a profession. First and foremost, we must define, for the public and for ourselves, the standards of proficiency, both linguistic and cultural, that we hope to achieve in the course of schooling. We must also convince the general public, as well as administrators and legislators, that

language education requires longer, uninterrupted sequences of instruction if we ever hope to achieve these standards. Language teachers will need to have the necessary financial and released time support to engage in professional development activities that will help them improve classroom instruction, incorporating communicative language use and global education concepts into their teaching. Materials will have to respond to the exigencies of foreign language and international studies curricula of the 80s, and effective ways to test outcomes of instructional sequences will have to be developed that will coincide with the standards of competence we have set as our goals.

Some specific recommendations of this committee regarding secondary school programs are the following:

(1) Some form of foreign language study should be part of the basic core curriculum required of all students at the secondary school level.
(2) Foreign language study should be coordinated with the social studies and other areas of the curriculum to foster a global perspective.
(3) Foreign language study should be begun as early as possible, preferably in the middle school or earlier, to enable students to achieve an acceptable and usable level of proficiency in the target language.
(4) National guidelines, such as those being developed by ACTFL and ETS, should be used on a wide scale to measure levels of proficiency in all foreign languages and to ensure better articulation between and within programs of study.
(5) School districts and professional organizations should provide inservice training to teachers of foreign language in the areas of communicative methodology, textbook adaptation, proficiency testing using the national standards, global education, and the use of computers in the foreign language classroom.
(6) Magnet schools, international high schools, and the International Baccalaureate program should be expanded so that every major region and metropolitan area offers such a program for local students.
(7) Exchange programs should be continued and the number of American students participating in them increased.
(8) Foreign language teachers of the future should be prepared to teach more than one foreign language, or to teach a related subject matter area in the curriculum.
(9) Modern technological advances, such as the computer and microcomputer, should be integrated into foreign language programs. Training for teachers should be provided by colleges, universities, school districts, and professional organizations. More software needs to be created and distributed through a national clearinghouse, through publishers, or through professional organizations.
(10) Educational associations (both foreign language and others) should band together to establish effective task forces and plans, such as those exemplified by the state of New York and Illinois in this Report. A consortium of states might be set up in various regions of the country to carry out such plans in a united effort to effect significant change.

(11) Professional organizations should commission nationwide studies to identify, describe, and evaluate effective foreign language and global education programs, and to disseminate information to those wishing to establish similar programs in their own schools. The Modern Language Association's *Options and Perspectives* and ACTFL's *Award-Winning Foreign Language Programs: Prescriptions for Success* may serve as models for future efforts of this kind.

(12) Professional organizations such as ACTFL and state and regional associations should begin producing guidelines for more effective curricula, coordinating these guidelines with the proficiency standards currently being developed by ACTFL/ETS. Coordination of curricular guidelines with proficiency standards is absolutely essential to ensure a united, national effort to improve the state of foreign language study in this country in the years ahead.

The foreign language teaching profession must continue to act forcefully to ensure success in building programs in the next decade. The 80s have been marked as a decade for change: the years immediately following the President's Commission may offer the last opportunity in this century for us to make the changes needed to prepare our citizens to face present and future realities. This committee presents its Report in the hope that all responsible individuals and groups will work together to improve the state of foreign language education in the nation's schools, and to translate the above recommendations into action. Only then can the dream that we all share be reconciled with the realities we face in the years to come.

Notes

1. *Report of the Illinois Task Force on Foreign Language and International Studies*, 1979, p. 13.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 13-14.

3. The New York State Board of Regents was to vote on this plan in September 1982.

4. *Public Awareness Newsletter*, vol. 1, nos. 1-2 (March 1982 and May 1982). The state activities summarized in this section have been extracted and condensed from material prepared by ACTFL.

5. R. Marshall Brannon and David E. Cox, "Coping with the Real Problems in Secondary Schools," in Gilbert A. Jarvis, ed., *ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education*, vol. 8 (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1976), pp. 151-199.

"See also Henry M. Brickell and Regina H. Paul, "Ready for the 80s? A Look at Foreign Language Teachers and Teaching At the Start of the Decade," *Foreign Language Annals*, vol. 15, no. 3 (May 1982), pp. 169-87. This report, conducted by Policy Studies in Education, summarizes the results of a nation-wide survey on a variety of issues in teaching preparation and inservice training, teacher workload, and related "realities" teachers face in the nation's secondary schools."

6. "A Design for Measuring and Communicating Foreign Language Proficiency." U.S. Dept. of Education Grant #G008103203.

7. William D. Sims and Sandra B. Hammond, *Award-Winning Foreign Language Programs: Prescriptions for Success*. (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1981), pp. 28-30.

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 68-71.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 106-7.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 106-8.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 125-27.
12. Thomas H. Geno, ed., *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration*, 1981 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1981).
13. Claudia S. Travers, "Exchanges and Travel Abroad in Secondary Schools," in *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration*, Thomas H. Geno, ed. 1981, Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1981), pp. 91-113.
14. William D. Sims and Sandra B. Hammond, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-41.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 70.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 189.
17. *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability.* A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, November 1979.
18. Dorothy B. Goodman and Glynis Scott, "The International High School: A Challenge for Scholars", in June K. Phillips, ed. *Action for the 80s, ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series*, vol. 11 (Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1981), pp. 158-59.
19. *Ibid.*, pp. 165-68.
20. Alan C. Purves. "The International High School: A Model Proposed by the University of Illinois in Cooperation with the Illinois State Board of Education and CEMREL Incorporated." *Foreign Language Annals*, vol. 13, no. 3 (May 1980), pp. 183-89.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 185.
22. *Ibid.*, pp. 187-89.
23. *Restoring a Challenge to Secondary Education: The International Baccalaureate Program.* (New York: International Baccalaureate North America, 1982.)
24. Thomas H. Geno, ed., *op. cit.*
25. "Everything You Always Wanted to Know About S.I.S. . . . But Were Afraid to Ask." Hillcrest High School, Jamaica, New York. (Pamphlet).
26. "School of International Studies Program Information Package." Hillcrest High School, Jamaica, New York, April, 1980. (Pamphlet).
27. William D. Sims and Sandra B. Hammond, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 88-9.
29. John S. Harrison, "Applications of Computer Technology in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning," in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Life-long Learner*, Robert G. Mead, Jr., ed. 1982, Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1982), p. 147.

References

"A Design for Measuring and Communicating Foreign Language Proficiency." U.S. Department of Education Grant # G008103203.

A Guide to Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad. (New York: Council on Student Travel, 1965.)

Assessing Study and Travel Abroad Programs. A Guide for Local School Districts. (The New York State Education Department, Albany, NY, 1980.)

Birdsong, David. *Computer Assisted and Programmed Instruction in Foreign Languages: A Selected Annotated Bibliography.* (EDRS: ED 138 087.)

Brannon, Marshall and David E. Cox. "Coping with the Real Problems in Secondary Schools," in Gilbert A. Jarvis, ed., *ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education*, vol. 8 (Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1976), pp. 151-99.

CAI-FL/ESL Newsletter. Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan-Feb, 1979).

Classroom Computer News. Vol. 1, no. 4 (March-April, 1981).

Dodge, James W. "Educational Technology," in Thomas H. Geno, ed. *Our Profession/Present Status and Future Directions*, 1980 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1980).

"Everything You Always Wanted to Know About S.I.S. . . . But Were Afraid to Ask," Hillcrest High School, Jamaica, NY. (Pamplet).

Goodman, Dorothy B. and Glynis Scott. "The International High School: A Challenge for Scholars," in June K. Phillips, ed., *Action for the 80s: A Political, Professional and Public Program for Foreign Language Education*. (Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Co., 1980), pp. 147-78.

Harrison, John S. "Applications of Computer Technology in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning," in Robert G. Mead, ed., *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Life-long Learner*. 1982 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1982), pp. 143-51.

MICRO — The Journal of The Society for Microcomputer Applications in Language and Literature. Vol. 1, no. 3 (September, 1980).

"Microcomputers . . . The Future is Now." *The Practitioner*. Newsletter of the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Vol. 4, no. 1 (October 1979).

Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Priorities. (Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1980.)

Public Awareness Newsletter. Vol. 1, nos. 1-2 (March-May, 1982).

Purves, Alan C. "The International High School: A Model Proposed by the University of Illinois in Cooperation with the Illinois State Board of Education and CEMREL Incorporated." *Foreign Language Annals*, vol. 13, no. 3 (May 1980), pp. 183-89.

Raths, James. "An International High School: Some Issues in Teacher Education." (Statement prepared for the National Seminar on the Implementation of International Schools, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, November 30 - December 3, 1980).

Report of the Illinois Task Force on Foreign Languages and International Studies, 1979.

Restoring a Challenge to Secondary Education. The International Baccalaureate. (New York: International Baccalaureate North America, 1982.)

"School of International Studies Program Information Package." Jamaica, New York: Hillcrest High School. (Pamphlet).

Sims, William D. and Sandra B. Hammond. *Award-Winning Foreign Language Programs: Prescriptions for Success*. (Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Company, 1981).

Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability. A Report to the President from the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. (Washington, D.C., 1979.)

Travers, Claudia S. "Exchange and Travel Abroad in Secondary Schools," in Thomas H. Geno, ed., *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration*. 1981 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1981), pp. 91-115.

Appendix

The Illinois Plan: Resource Persons in Illinois

Illinois Task Force and Plan for Language and International Studies
Mr. Paul T. Griffith
Educational Consultant
Programming Planning and Development
Illinois State Board of Education
Springfield, IL 62777

Consortium for Language and International Studies
Dr. Joseph Di Lillo
Professor of Social Studies
Lincoln College
Lincoln, IL 62656

Language and International Studies Network
Ms. Lyric Hughes
President
Trans-Lingual Communications, Inc.
8 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, IL 60603

National Seminar on the Implementation of International Schools and University Language and International Studies High School
Dr. Alan C. Purves
Director
Curriculum Laboratory
University of Illinois
1212 West Springfield
Urbana, IL 61801

Glenbrook Academy of International Studies
Messrs. Dennis Gilliam and Rob Adams
Co-Directors
Glenbrook Academy of International Studies
Glenview, IL 60025

Morgan Park Language and International Studies High School
Mr. Marty Gabriel
Principal
Morgan Park High School
1744 West Pryor Avenue
Chicago, IL 60643

Illinois Curriculum Development Project in Mexico and George Williams College Immersion Weekends
Ms. Luz Maria Berd
Professor of Modern Languages
George Williams College
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Illinois Language Proficiency Testing Project
Ms. Claudette Dwyer
Executive Director
Council of West Suburban Colleges
Lisle, IL 60532

International Education via Satellite Project
Mr. Walter Westrum
Superintendent
Hall Township High School
Spring Valley, IL 61362

Chicago Language Academics
Mr. Edwin Cudecki
Coordinator of Foreign Languages
Chicago Public Schools
228 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601

Highland Community College Teachers Center
Mr. Wendell Kurr
Professor of Modern Languages
Highland Community College
Freeport, IL 61032

Illinois State University Teachers Center
Dr. James Pontillo
Professor of Modern Languages
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

Contacts for Programs Cited

Exploratory Courses
Mary Renne Chi
Millard Public Schools
12801 "L" Street
Omaha, NE 68137
Phone: 402-895-8250

Rick Heidt
Bismark High School
700 Seventh Street
Bismarck, ND 58501
Phone: 701-223-8640

Albert E. Lynch
Brattleboro Union High School
Fairground Road
Brattleboro, VT 05301
Phone: 802-257-0356

David J. Florian
Harvard School

3700 Coldwater Canyon Road
North Hollywood, CA 91604
Phone: 213-980-6692

Delbert C. Hausman
Foreign Language Department
Lower Moreland School District
555 Red Lion Road
Huntington Valley, PA 19006
Phone: 215-947-2200 X 158

Exchange Programs

AFS International/Intercultural Programs
313 East 43d Street
New York, NY 10017

American Institute for Foreign Study
102 Greenwich Avenue
Greenwich, CT 06830

Franco-American Committee for Educational Travel and Studies
683 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10022

GAPP, Goethe House — New York
1014 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10028

Ibero-American Cultural Exchange Program
13920 93rd Avenue, N.E.
Kirkland, WA 98033

Intercultural Student Experiences
31 Water Street
Excelsior, MN 55331

School Exchange Service
205 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017

The Experiment in International Living
Kipling Road
Brattleboro, VT 05301

Youth for Understanding
3501 Newark Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016

Summer Programs for Individuals

Alliance Française (France)
301 Boulevard Raspail
75270 Paris

Centre de Séjours Linguistiques Culturels (France)
12 Rue Gabriel-Peri
63000 Clermont-Ferrand

Studies Munich (Germany)
Amalienstrasse 67
8000 Munich 40

Spanish Heritage Association (Spain)
175-10 Queens Boulevard
Forest Hills, NY 11375

Centro Linguistico (Italy)
Italiano-Dante Alighieri
Via de Bardo 12
P.O. Box 194
50100 Florence

International High School

Washington International School
Washington, D.C.

International Baccalaureate

International Baccalaureate North America
680 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10019

Global Education/International Studies

School of International Studies
Hillcrest High School
160-05 Highland Avenue
Jamaica, NY 11432

Computer Assisted Instruction

Dr. Jose Montero
Northern Virginia Community College
Annandale, VA 20030

Society for Microcomputer Applications in Language and Literature
MICRO
University Station, P.O. Box 7134
Provo, Utah 84602

Ed Cutshall
Cupertino High School
10100 Finch Avenue
Cupertino, CA 95014
Telephone: 08-735-6428

Contacts at Some Schools Currently Engaged in the Use of Microcomputers and Computer Terminals in the Foreign Language Classroom

Dora Kennedy
Prince George's County Public School
Upper Marlboro, MD 20772

Gladys Lipton
Anne Arundel County Public Schools
2644 Riva Rd.
Annapolis, MD 21401

Sherry Suter
(Microcomputer Language Labs)
Broadneck High School
1265 Green Holly Dr.
Annapolis, MD 21401

Elie de Comminges
The Chapin School
100 East End Ave.
New York, NY

Anthony J. DeNapoli
Shoreham-Wading River High School
Route 25-A
Shoreham, NY 11786

Patrick Finnegan
Millburn Junior High School
Millburn, NJ 07041

John Harrison
Baltimore County Public Schools
6901 N. Charles Street
Towson, MD 21204

Irene Koppel and Louis Rodriguez
Bernards High School
25 Olcutt St.
Bernardsville, NJ 07925

Kay Lyons
Half Hollow Hills High School East
50 Vanderbuilt Pkwy.
Dix Hills, NY

Linda Thiergart
Roslyn Junior High School
Locust Lane
Roslyn, NY 11576

Harry Tuttle
Cicero High School
Route 31
Cicero, NY 13039

Claire Gaudiani, *Chair, University of Pennsylvania*
Patricia Cummins, *University of West Virginia*
Humphrey Tonkin, *University of Pennsylvania*

"Nurturing the Ties that Bind": Links Between Foreign Language Departments and the Rest of the Post-secondary Educational Enterprise

Introduction

Foreign language and literature departments in post-secondary institutions in the last few years have forged a number of links with other departments and schools in their institutions. These ties have strengthened foreign language and literature courses and improved departments by increasing student enrollments, clarifying faculty members' sense of purpose, and alerting non-foreign language and literature faculty to the contribution foreign language learning brings to students in a wide range of fields. As language requirements return to many campuses, students today are finding options and tracks that were unavailable in 1970.

Part One of this Report will cover some of the program developments that link departments of foreign language and literature with other units in the arts and science curriculum. Programs linking foreign language with history, philosophy, ethics, anthropology, sociology, political science, and economics have several names: international studies, multicultural, interdisciplinary, or cross-cultural studies, or global education. A second category links foreign language departments and English departments. These curricular developments indicate a new or renewed awareness of the relationship between thinking and writing well in a language and the contribution that composition skill in a foreign language can make to an American student's ability to write better in English.

Part Two will cover some programs that link depa[illegible]ments of foreign language and

literature to business and other professional and career oriented education. In each of these sections, the connections developed in the recent past have brought major alterations to the content of foreign language and literature courses. As the links become stronger in the next five years, curriculum in the *non-foreign language and literature* areas should, if the language departments are really successful, begin to show evidence of substantial change. For instance, suggested reading lists in anthropology or political science courses will include items written in foreign languages. Two-semester composition requirements will permit students to opt for the second semester course in a foreign language writing class. Business and professional courses will include contemporary texts and documents from the foreign language press. Internships abroad will be more widely available to American students. All students will have ample opportunity to see their instructors and student colleagues *use* their foreign language skills.

Part Three will suggest some future directions that link the foreign language department to new constituencies, new technology, and new professional relationships with colleagues. This section indicates that the ties currently being developed between the foreign language department and the world around it are not based solely on revised curricula. For instance, traditional courses can be packaged and presented in formats that enable more working people to take them. We can report that new technology designed to permit two-way interactive, live satellite communication is in experimental stages. Ten years from now this technology may enable American students in foreign language classes to meet and speak with people whose language and culture they are studying. The horizon is bright. And, closer to home, foreign language and literature faculty have begun to develop more extensive links connecting foreign language and literature faculty in universities and colleges with their colleagues in high schools and elementary schools.[1]

In the five years since the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies and the Rockefeller Commission helped publicize the lack of global awareness in the United States, many foreign language and literature departments have responded by creating the kinds of programs discussed briefly in this Report on developments in post-secondary education.

The departments mentioned in each section will respond to inquiries for further information on their efforts. Because the limited scope of this Report did not permit comprehensive coverage of each category, some fine programs have inevitably been overlooked. We believe, however, that we have made a useful selection of some of the better and brighter ideas that are currently working in a wide range of institutions, thus illustrating the inspiration and hard work of the faculty who have created them.

Part One: Cross-Curricular Links

International Studies[2]

Any dispassionate observer, looking at traditional foreign language programs in American colleges and universities, would be struck by two features of these pro-

grams, which on reflection, may seem slightly odd. First, they have always been firmly linked to the teaching of literature. Literature, we are told rightly, provides insight into a culture and offers a way of examining the everyday life of a country through the critical sensibility of its major artists. Furthermore, since its subject matter is broad and diverse, it offers a range of contexts and of linguistic forms. Finally, its language constitutes a model, or set of models, of what is socially acceptable, thus providing material for imitation.

To approach the teaching of a language merely as a preparation for the study of literature is risky and shortsighted, however. It takes for granted a student's interest in the particularities of literary discourse; it is based on a historical approach to a culture that is not shared by all students, and it assumes that the correct way to understand a culture is through high art. Such an approach in many respects merely reflects the interests of the teachers themselves, trained in literary studies and, in many cases, more interested in literature than in language.

Furthermore, while programs designed for the undergraduate majors usually aim at the production of competent users of a language, those designed for non-majors do not always share this goal, or if they do, they often fail to achieve it. Advocates of the traditional "seat time" or credit hour requirements that feed such programs usually make two assumptions: that it is good to "expose" a student to a foreign language in and of itself, whether or not that student achieves proficiency; and that it is good to bring a student to the threshold of language competence, imparting knowledge that will allow him or her to go on to use the language, with additional training, at a later date. On the other hand, it has been fairly well established, first, that students do not for the most part acquire a usable command of the language merely through completing language requirements, and second, that most students do not elect to continue with the study of the language they have used to fulfill a language requirement.

Both of these characteristics of college language programs — teaching a language through literature, and bringing students to the threshold of competence — are perfectly laudable in themselves, when they work. But, they are a rather slender reed on which to support entire college-wide foreign language requirements, or even foreign language departments. This is especially true in today's educational climate, with its stress on the practical and the marketable. There must always be a place, perhaps a paramount place, for literature in the foreign language classroom, but the use of other subject matter is an essential enhancement to any language. As for the question of competence, it is hard to sustain a student's interest in a language on mere promises for the future. Problems of motivation are bound to arise. It might be better to pay more attention to motivation by providing the student with opportunities for the practical use of the language almost from the outset, and by offering ways in which knowledge of foreign languages can bring rewards outside the language classroom.[3]

The language teaching profession has in recent years seen several attempts to respond to these essential needs,[4] including, for example, a noticeable shift of emphasis towards other types of subject matter than literature. There is an increasing interest, among other things, in the teaching of "culture" — though we should note that this potentially ambiguous term can mean different things to different people. For some it means Michelangelo; for others it means soap commercials; for still others

it means kinship patterns. Certainly it is more and more common for language teachers to examine with their students the institutions and values of the target country or countries.

In itself this approach is not new. Language teachers have always taught their students something about the daily life of the countries whose languages they are learning, and recently, more and more language teachers have begun to emphasize the need to continue to link the target language to events of the day, to politics, to social organization. If the publishers of textbooks are any guide to changing tastes, contemporary history, politics and patterns of life are beginning to take the place of literature in many classrooms. Periodicals in the target language, taped radio and television programs, and a host of similar products of our age are finding their way into our curricula. We can only welcome this development, not because it weakens the hold of the purely literary approach, but because it recognizes that the goals of language learning are multiple, and that language is an important element in the general education of undergraduates.

There are many statements on what this general education should contain. Educators of the 1970s, gloomily surveying what many viewed as the destruction wrought on academic programs by the Vietnam era and student protests, spilled much ink and lobbied before many faculty meetings in an attempt to describe and bring into being the ideal core curriculum.[5] In the late 1970s, stimulated by such bodies as the U.S. Office of Education's Task Force on Global Education and President Carter's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, language and other educators turned particular attention to the question of the international dimension of undergraduate education.[6] They stressed, and continue to stress, the need, in a global political economy that is more and more integrated, and in a world in which interdependence is a fact, for a fuller understanding of other cultures and other peoples. They pointed to our students' lack of basic knowledge and their inability to empathize with other cultures. In appeals to the right, they stressed this country's need to compete; in appeals to the left, they stressed its need to coexist.

Despite the extent and passion of the debate, no clear agreement emerged on the role of language teaching. Most people involved in the discussion stressed the importance of language learning, though it remains an open question whether the learning of a foreign language, at least as foreign languages are generally taught, does in fact create a sense of the relativity of cultures and languages and an awareness of the place of the student in a global system. Mere knowledge of a second culture, if it is not accompanied by constant emphasis on cultural relativity and by a kind of comprehensive comparative approach, may merely create a split sense of biculturalism. The Council on Learning, in its statement on the core curriculum,[7] in effect anticipates this objection by implying that a student needs three perspectives: an awareness of his or her own cultural and social values, an awareness of the cultural and social values of a second nation or people, and a global view in which the relativity of cultures and the interconnectedness of world issues becomes clear. It is the second of these three elements, suggests the Council on Learning, that a foreign language is intended to inculcate.

While such a line of argument assigns foreign language teaching an important place in the college curriculum of the future, it is in many respects a narrow view. In

the traditional classroom, foreign languages do indeed provide access to a second culture. In fact, they are often taught by extremely persuasive apologists for that second culture. But, it is not unreasonable to ask more of the language teacher. Language learning, if properly carried out, can assist in the development of an awareness not only of a second culture but of all cultures. We should resist the notion, latent in the Council on Learning's statement, that biculturalism is for the language teacher and multiculturalism is the province of the social scientist. There is a place for the comprehensive international view in the foreign language classroom. International studies, broadly conceived, and foreign language can be brought together. An approach to language learning that stresses the immediate accessibility of the contemporary world through the target language, and that puts emphasis on an approach to global problems through the perspective of a second language and culture, can provide the student with information and ideas applicable elsewhere in the curriculum, especially if an effort is made to coordinate the language curriculum with other programs in the institution. This, in turn, can help develop motivation and stimulate learning to bring the student to the point at which he or she can cross the threshold at which a language becomes useful and enter, as a visitor if not a resident, a new yet not wholly alien structure, from whose windows he or she may see the world with a new perspective.

A first requirement here is a proper understanding on the part of the teacher of the relations among cultures, and of the processes whereby institutions are established and evolve.[8] Hence the need to make common cause with teachers of the social sciences. Until Ph.D. programs open themselves up to such influences, most teachers of the commonly taught languages will continue to receive all or almost all of their training in literature and literary analysis. We emphasize that these topics and techniques are important, but they need not nor ought to be pursued to the exclusion of others. Certainly if our teachers are to examine with any sophistication all aspects of the societies whose languages they teach, and if they are to have some understanding of other societies as well, they will need some acquaintance with the methodology of the social sciences and with the kinds of issues that social scientists address.

For example, the sociologist or the anthropologist can teach the language teacher how to look at culture from a new vantage point — not in terms of the monuments of high art, not in terms of the vision of itself that a society has created through overt artistic structures, but in terms of how a society perceives time, how it organizes itself socially, how it deals with birth and death. Social and cultural anthropology and comparative sociology have something to tell mainstream Americans even about nations as close to them as the French, or the Germans, or the Hispanic.

But French (for example) is also the language of Haiti and of Guadeloupe; it is the official language of the former French colonies in Africa. There is Belgium, too, to be considered — and its former colony Zaire. And there is Canada, with its large French-speaking population. Not to take these people into consideration in teaching French is to miss the richness of the cultural experience that French can open up to the student. Yet taking them fully into consideration and, beyond them, the nations with whom they have dealings, demands a wide range of skills and a kind of inclusiveness of vision that requires cultivation.

Just as anthropology and sociology are useful in the foreign language classroom, so

is political science, and so is economics. Obviously they are particularly relevant in their application to international affairs, that is to say international studies. Most language teachers make an effort to follow the politics of the metropolis, if nothing else. But how many teachers of Spanish can speak knowledgeably about the politics of Spanish America, or, more specifically, the domestic politics of its major Spanish-speaking countries, like Argentina, Peru, Venezuela, Mexico? And what of the views of these countries about other countries? Consider the case of France. From our reading of certain American newspapers we might easily conclude that French foreign policy is either amoral or irrational. Is that a reasonable view? What can we learn from comparing French attitudes towards arms sales with those of this country? How can the French press help us understand European attitudes toward the Soviet gas pipeline? What can the German press tell us about the anti-nuclear movement in Europe? Of course, there is no end to such questions, no end to the need to learn and to teach one's students to learn. What of the vagaries of the international commodities market, or the role of the European Currency Unit, or the principles behind the New International Economic Order? Above all, how many teachers of language can move beyond the particular culture they are teaching to inculcate in their students a truly global view?[9]

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

These links to global education are worth striving for. Perhaps more than any other field, language teaching calls for the skills of the polymath. Hence the importance of good ties with faculty members in other disciplines and a constant interchange of ideas between the language departments and the others. In many institutions colleagues anxious to increase the international element in their curriculum stress the importance of the faculty seminar — the brownbag lunch or the early evening get-together in which a given faculty member discusses with colleagues some current aspect of international affairs. The topic might be a major crisis or crisis area — the Middle East, Central America, the South Atlantic — or it might be a major world problem — refugees, health care delivery in developing countries, the problems of agricultural development in Africa, disarmament, the international role of the mass media. If faculty members are asked to prepare themselves in advance, and if the speaker prepares materials for distribution to the other participants, the language teacher can both contribute a different perspective, primarily by reporting on current views of the problems in other parts of the world, and also take away much valuable material that can be worked into his or her classroom teaching. In fact, an entire semester's syllabus could be structured around such a faculty seminar.

The social sciences can contribute in yet another way to the language teacher, almost as important as a knowledge of the world: they can teach him or her a great deal about language. Views on the nature of language are changing. Linguistics, once the preserve of the philologist, is more and more a branch of social sciences. If Ph.D. programs are traditional in their emphasis on literature, they also tend to be traditional in their teaching of linguistics. Few teachers of language emerge from such programs with any strong awareness of how language works as a social institution, how it shapes and directs international communication, how it stratifies a society as well as uniting it. With the emergence into political consciousness of the Spanish-

speaking community in this country, with the growth of francophone politics in Canada, or of Breton, Basque, and Catalan separatism, the language teacher is obliged to a greater and greater extent to develop an awareness and understanding of these issues.

But it is easier to talk of acquiring such skills than it is actually to acquire them. If the training of Ph.D.'s in language is narrow, if Ph.D. programs emphasize literature with a smattering of linguistics, the social sciences on the other hand, at least as they are taught in this country, give precious little attention to language skills. Many Ph.D. programs in the social sciences do not even require a knowledge of a foreign language, and even those that do seldom actually require that their students be able to use a foreign language with relative ease. The American tradition of anthropology is dominated, if not monopolized, by the giants of the English-speaking academy. Sociology and economics, at least as they are taught here, are essentially English-speaking fields. In short, the social scientists stand to gain as much from an exchange with the language teachers as the language teachers can gain from the social scientists. The more cosmopolitan of social scientists recognize the linguistic deficiency in the teaching of their disciplines. They are aware of the fact that their disciplines are distorted by the dominance of English. But the forging of a coalition of language teachers and social scientists will be no easy task, particularly if it is to be based on a kind of equality of intellectual opportunity.

Where faculty members from the social sciences and languages are able to work together, many approaches are possible. The foreign language teacher may actually go to the social science teacher to gather skills and knowledge that can then be worked into the foreign language syllabus. In this case foreign languages and international studies are in effect united in a single foreign language teacher. The same may happen in the opposite direction if a teacher of international studies or the social sciences chooses to use foreign language texts in the classroom, perhaps working with faculty members in foreign languages to improve his or her command of the target language.

In other cases, elements or modules in international studies can be incorporated into the foreign language curriculum, for example by having teachers of the social sciences who also have a command of the target language visit a foreign language class to lecture or lead a discussion. Such modules can be supplemented with appropriate readings.

In both of these instances, integration of foreign language and international studies takes place in a single classroom. Somewhat easier methodologically, but requiring broader cooperation among elements in an institution, is a minor or major program in foreign languages and international studies, or in the culture and society of the target country. In these instances, relatively traditional foreign language courses can be adapted to dovetail with English-language courses in culture and society. More difficult to achieve, primarily because students may find it hard to reach the required level of proficiency, is a set of courses actually taught in the target language, paralleling the language courses themselves.

In each of the examples described so far, the aim has been to provide material on the target country or region, either as a language-teaching device or for its own sake. A few institutions, however, have developed courses in foreign languages that have little or nothing to do with the countries in which these languages are spoken. In some

instances a system of parallel credit is available, a student receiving credit both for the content of the course and for the language in which it is taught. Allied to such experience in the American classroom is of course the experience of study abroad. Most foreign-language programs of study in other countries do tend to concentrate on the society and culture (or literature) of the country in question, but many American students study other topics in foreign lecture-halls, side by side with their host-country peers. Study abroad is, after all, an ideal way of linking language study with the practical experience of another society. Yet it also offers opportunities to study the world from a different cultural vantage point.

CASE STUDIES

Let us now look at a few practical examples of links between the study of foreign languages and what we can broadly describe as international studies. We will begin with a program that seeks to break out of the traditional "metropolitan" approach to foreign language learning. Teachers at Hampton Institute, in Virginia, a historically Black liberal arts college, have been working over the past few years on a program entitled AFCELL: African Cultural Elements in Language Learning. The program teaches first- and second-year Spanish and French through the use of Afro-Spanish and Afro-French cultural materials. These materials are drawn from history, anthropology, demography, and geography, as well as from literature and the arts. Working with other institutions with a largely Black population, Hampton has developed a series of modules on such topics as African and Latin American folk tales, Senegalese family life, and the political geography of francophone West Africa. These modules include test materials and are accompanied by kits containing pamphlets, overhead transparencies, videotapes, posters, or other relevant material. They have recently received their first public exposure in a workshop for teachers of French and Spanish organized at Hampton in the summer of 1982.[10]

The Cross-Cultural and Foreign Language Resource Center at Central Virginia Community College, in Lynchburg, provides special or short-term instruction in languages through a self-paced program that is supplemented with "cultural packages" providing brief introductions to aspects of the target culture, such as political and legal structures, art, music, customs, and food.[11] Efforts of this kind to summarize the salient aspects of a culture are relatively common (the "culturegrams" of Brigham Young University might be cited in this connection), but they must be constructed with great care, to avoid the broad generalizations that often pass for cross-cultural studies in this country.[12]

At Earlham College, in Richmond, Indiana, a program funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities provides released time for faculty members in the humanities and social sciences to attend courses taught by their foreign language colleagues.[13] The aim is to create or revive foreign language skills that can then be worked into instruction in the social sciences. Foreign language faculty members move in the opposite direction: released time allows them to take courses in the social sciences. This cross-fertilization and the shift in emphasis that it will produce on both sides of the disciplinary line will naturally put considerable strain on library resources. For this reason, the program includes a component whereby library staff work closely with the faculty in building library collections in foreign languages, particularly in the social sciences, and making existing resources more accessible.

This is very necessary, since the libraries of small colleges, even those as well established and as internationalized as Earlham, may be sorely taxed to support a teaching program of this kind. Furthermore, catalogues are not normally organized in terms of languages, so that locating the materials that do exist may prove something of a problem.

The Earlham program is expensive. It requires a great deal of released time. It also puts considerable strain on the teachers of the humanities and the social sciences who choose to use foreign language texts in the classroom. There are several reasons for this. First, the texts must be selected and made available in suitable form. Earlham has developed manuals containing texts in certain subject areas with running glosses to accompany them, so that even those students with a relatively weak knowledge of the target language can participate. Second, not all students signing up for a course in, say, modern German history can be expected to have a knowledge of German, so more than one stream must be created, or extra study sessions arranged. In modern philosophy the situation may be still more complicated, with some students working with German texts, others with French, and still others with Spanish. Yet in one sense the sheer complexity of it all is the most valuable academic lesson: the world of learning *is* a babel of tongues, and not everything worth knowing is immediately accessible in English, nor even entirely reliable in a translated text. As for the cost of the program, it is hoped that over time such activities will be accepted by students and faculty as routine, and that ways will be found to accommodate them. As a result, language knowledge will assume a relevancy in the non-language classroom that for the most part it lacks in American institutions at present.

There are of course other ways of providing faculty members with opportunities to develop their knowledge of the social sciences, or indeed for faculty outside languages to learn new languages and revive old language skills. At the State University of New York at Albany, for example, Professor Georges Santoni has twice run summer institutes to provide faculty members from around the country with an opportunity to update and reorient their curricula to take into account the socio-cultural patterns that form the context for language. The institutes emphasize a synchronic view of their subject and stress participation in the classroom. Teachers are encouraged, as the description of the most recent institute puts it "to gather, produce, and organize, into purposeful learning units, a corpus of visual and reading material representing specific, authentic and up-to-date French social and cultural patterns."

Summer institutes of this kind, open to faculty members from many institutions, may be a considerably less expensive way of providing teachers with new skills than elaborate cooperative efforts on individual campuses involving reallocation of teaching time. However, the advantage of diffusing skills through many institutions simultaneously is offset by the benefits that accrue from the creation of a critical mass of interest in new techniques such as we find at Earlham. Of course, ideally faculty members in languages will start out with expertise in the social sciences, through a Ph.D. program that is not based exclusively on literature. New York University offers one such model — an advanced French Studies Program that puts emphasis on the social sciences — but programs of this kind are rare.

If there are relatively few attempts to provide the beginning language teacher with knowledge of the social sciences, even less is done in the opposite direction. Outside

the area studies programs at major research universities, which seldom produce teachers of the more commonly taught languages, the opportunities are few. An additional problem is the fact that knowledge of foreign languages does relatively little to enhance a social science professor's standing in the eyes of his or her peers, just as teachers of foreign languages gain few points for a knowledge of anthropology or political science in a field where literary analysis continues to dominate.

Earlham College is too small to allow the creation of non-language courses (that is to say courses outside the foreign language department) for which knowledge of a given language is a prerequisite. Even at the larger institutions such courses are a rarity, as Richard Lambert established in a recent survey.[4] A few of these larger research universities offer such courses in history or politics, though seldom at the undergraduate level. Some institutions offer courses such as one in the Slavic program at The Ohio State University. It is designed for non-language majors who wish to maintain their skills in Russian and relies largely on non-literary readings.

Central Virginia Community College, mentioned above, offers a bilingual course on Latin America, in which the basic lectures are offered in English, and these lectures are supplemented by two sectional meetings, one in English for non-language credit, and one in Spanish for foreign language credit. Bergen Community College and Rockland Community College, in New Jersey and New York respectively, are among numbers of community colleges offering courses taught in Spanish in a number of fields, though these cater, at least in part, to a Spanish-speaking population.

An ambitious new program at Boston College, funded by the U.S. Department of Education, calls for the integration of language study with a full range of other disciplines. "A series of five required or elective courses from six disciplines," state the authors of the proposal, will be presented in French at the college "during two consecutive semesters to a maximum of 25 undergraduate students who have fulfilled the prerequisite of at least two years of college French or the equivalent." Participating faculty members will be senior members of the departments of economics, philosophy, theology, fine arts, history, and sociology. A coordinating course, taught by a faculty member in Romance languages, will be required of all students participating in the program.

A new program at the University of Illinois, due to begin this year, will consist of a group of courses using several European languages, sometimes in the same course. All will deal with aspects of West European studies. "Politics and Economics of European Integration" will be multilingual, as will "Dimensions and Determinants of West European Security and Arms." A course dealing with U.S.-German relations will use both German and English. The program is based on active cooperation between the language departments and faculty members in business and the social sciences. Built around the existing language expertise of the Illinois faculty, it will in some cases set up prerequisites for entry into individual courses (e.g., a knowledge of German) and in some cases simply draw on whatever language expertise a given group of enrollees displays. At Indiana University, the Western European Studies program has been in place for a number of years.

It is perhaps only at institutions with a special mission that courses in non-literary subjects taught in the target language can take hold relatively easily. At the Monterey Institute of International Studies, for example, the Division of Languages and

Humanities offers courses in the target language in such subjects as French Institutions and Media, The German-Speaking World, and Economic Geography and the Peoples of the USSR. Monterey Institute, an upper-level and graduate institution, offers an M.A. degree in Language and International Policy Studies that integrates language learning and the social sciences.

Middlebury College, always thought of as a leader in language instruction, has in the last several years witnessed something of a change in the focus of its language programs, as emphasis has shifted away from exclusive concentration on literary studies towards increased stress on culture, economics, and politics. A new international major will be implemented in the fall of 1982. This major seeks to combine foreign language training with another discipline and then to have the student study that discipline (political science, anthropology, art history, and so on) at one of Middlebury's five overseas schools. Hence it combines, in a rare articulation of resources, programs on the home campus with study abroad.

Intensive language training combined with training in cross-cultural awareness is the order of the day at the Missionary Training Center of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, in Provo, Utah. The Center, one of the most remarkable language-training facilities in the world (making the state of Utah perhaps the largest untapped resource of foreign language knowledge in the United States), teaches twenty-nine languages in eight-week intensive units. Courses in the cultures of the target countries accompany the language program, providing students with some knowledge of these countries' perceptions and values, their traditions, their religion and philosophy. Like the well-developed language programs at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, the Utah program has a clearly discernible end-point: a posting in the target country and the need to make use of the language. Few things better concentrate the mind of the language learner.

It is in this context that Middlebury's program is distinctive. While in the liberal atmosphere of today's colleges one can hardly argue that fear plays a role in the Middlebury formula, the learning of languages is directly linked with their practical use in a foreign country. The School for International Training, in Brattleboro, Vermont, is able to achieve a similar effect through its World Issues Program, which consists of an initial period of 23 weeks in Brattleboro, an internship abroad of 30 weeks and a period of final review back at Brattleboro lasting thirteen weeks.

If study and work abroad are among the best ways of putting language learning to practical use, the most effective programs are likely to be those that put the student into foreign classrooms or workplaces. Susquehanna University's internship program, for example, does the latter, providing a limited number of students with placements in German and French business. At Kalamazoo College, the International Commerce Program, based in the liberal arts, includes a foreign travel component. Many programs provide their students with experience in a foreign classroom, and numerous students go abroad on their own, enrolling directly in foreign universities or participating (a less satisfactory option) in programs run by those universities for foreign students.

Numerous institutions encourage their students to take dual majors, combining study in the social sciences or in business with study in languages. In itself, this requires little integration of programs: connecting the two areas is the responsibility

of the student. But in some instances colleges offer special programs in foreign languages for students majoring in other fields. Like many institutions, Hood College in Maryland, for example, offers certificates of proficiency in several fields, but then backs its foreign language programs with internships in Washington requiring the use of other languages.

At the University of Pennsylvania the Department of Romance Languages offers an undergraduate major in French language and civilization, clearly differentiated from the traditional major in language and literature. The departmental offerings include courses in France Today, The French Business World, and France Since the War, all of them offered in the target language. This move away from a purely literary track is likely to be duplicated in many other institutions in the years ahead, not least because it represents a measured response to the "Business French" and "Business Spanish" phenomenon, by which beleaguered foreign language departments have sought to respond to shifts in student interest, sometimes with little planning and less expertise.

This brief survey of current developments in the linking of foreign languages and international studies has considered individual courses and entire programs, small and large colleges, liberal arts institutions and institutions with a specific international mission. Frequently programs and institutions deemed peripheral have turned out to be the pacesetters for the more constrained and traditionalist mainstream universities. The diversification of offerings in the more commonly-taught languages, for example, undoubtedly reflects the influence of area studies programs developed on the fringes of institutions. And those courses in Business French established by departments at risk have a direct bearing on the development of more sophisticated responses at the established institutions.

This process is particularly evident in a new program for beginning language learners developed at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, an institution barely fifteen years old, well-placed to experiment while older institutions wring their hands at falling language enrollments. The Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics at UMBC has created a three-track major, consisting of a one-language option in French, German, or Spanish, a two-language option, and an option in language and literary studies. All three tracks, however, begin with a common core of three courses, entitled The World of Language, Textual Analysis, and World Language Communities. The World of Language begins by attempting to define language, examining visual, auditory, and other sensory and social codes, animal and machine communication, the verbal and nonverbal. It then goes on to examine language strategies within a variety of cultures. The second course in the sequence, Textual Analysis, is not confined to literary texts, but considers legal documents, and historical, political, medical, and scientific writing. Nor is it confined to writing, since it also examines the relation of written texts to visual codes and to musical codes. The written texts are in English, for non-majors, or in the language of specialization, for language majors.

The third course in the sequence, World Language Communities, is, according to the catalogue "designed to expand the cultural awareness of students by introducing them to the study of language in a broad context of historical, political and social issues." Emphasis falls on "the question of bi- or multi-lingual states and on the explosiveness of the language issues in many regions."

So brief a description of the three courses hardly does justice to their content, which can only be described as revolutionary in its thoroughgoing emphasis on language as a social, political, and cultural phenomenon. In many respects it turns traditional language teaching on its head. Whereas in most institutions the linkage between language and the social sciences, if it takes place at all, takes place at a late stage or under the rubric of "language for special purposes," at UMBC the social aspects of language are the basis of which literary study is a later subdivision. The program at UMBC takes for granted that students must know what language is if they are ever to learn it properly. The popularity of the program (enrollments have risen steadily ever since it was instituted) proves that students perceive this as the right path. Perhaps in today's world, where language is so often an instrument of injustice, and where people are constantly assailed by spoken and written messages too complex or too numerous to be assimilated, there is a need to come to terms with language in this way.

It should be added that the UMBC program is in part team-taught, and involves faculty members from many disciplines. In this sense the Department of Modern Languages has made itself central to the intellectual and academic life of the institution. It remains to be seen how many other institutions will follow suit.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE

The initial section of this survey has focused on theory; the next, on practice. How can the reader apply these findings to his or her own institution? Where should the changes begin?

First it is important to know that one is not alone, that others are working on these same issues in their various ways. In the mid-1970s, Warren C. Born and Kathryn Buck published a survey of career-related, community-related, non-traditional, interdisciplinary foreign language courses entitled *Options for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Literatures and Cultures*, which provides numerous useful models for the foreign language teacher. Renate Schulz's more recent (1979) survey provides additional ideas. The annual volumes in the ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series, formerly called the ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education, are also useful, and ACTFL's *Foreign Language Annals* and the *Bulletin* of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages frequently contain articles on individual language programs or special techniques. Finally, the Council on Learning's *Handbook of Exemplary International Programs* (1981) describes several programs in foreign languages.

Recent years have seen numerous statements on the aims and purposes of international education or global education (each has its special nuance). Foremost among them is Robert Hanvey's lucid summary of the elements that go to make up his notion of "global awareness." More modest in intent is the Council on Learning's statement in connection with its Education and the World View project — a particularly useful piece of rhetorical argument for dealing with one's unconvinced colleagues or recalcitrant deans.

The art of lobbying for change, and the reasons for it, are set out most exhaustively in another product of the Education and the World View project, Tonkin and Edwards' *The World in the Curriculum* (1981). Barbara Burn, in her book *Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education* (1980) offers the facts and figures on the United States to substantiate the need for change. Both books include chapters

on language learning.

It is worth bearing in mind, however, that the individual language teacher can do much to improve or change his or her own syllabus without the need to consult with curriculum committees, department chairmen, deans, and other assorted stumbling blocks to the educational process. While there are relatively few textbooks that cross the divide between language and the social sciences, they do exist, and a few examples can be mentioned. EMC Publishing, in Saint Paul, Minnesota, has a set of culture-based texts in Spanish, German and French. Houghton Mifflin has been in the field for several years, one of its latest products being *En Contacto*, by Pablo Valencia and Franca Merlonghi, a first-year Spanish text that uses materials from the press as teaching devices and in which each unit concentrates on a different Spanish-speaking area. The National Textbook Company publishes *Spain After Franco*, again based on materials from the press.

As for foreign periodicals, EBSCO Subscription Services (1st Ave. N. at 13th Street, Birmingham, AL 35203) offers a range of publications of staggering completeness. Several of the more popular American magazines are now published in Spanish, and French magazines are relatively easily available from Canada. Newspapers in German, Russian, and Spanish are all published in this country, the last in great profusion.

The theoretical issues involved in the teaching of culture from an anthropological perspective in the foreign language classroom are by no means all resolved, but several authors, among them Seelye, Lafayette, and Nostrand, have written on the subject. As for international studies, the 1981 Northeast Conference Reports was devoted to *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration* (ed. Geno). Strasheim (1981) and Judith Torney-Purta (1982) might also be consulted.

What of the future? How can the links between language teaching and the social sciences develop? There are still many hurdles to be crossed, among them the question of Ph.D. programs, which must be opened up to training in the social sciences, and the problem of faculty development, an expensive and complex undertaking. Yet our profession's newly won knowledge of the role of language in society is not likely to disappear, nor will the interdependence of the world's peoples decrease significantly, any more than the monoglot American is likely to prosper in today's multilingual and multicultural marketplace. For all these reasons, the trends identified in this review of international education can be expected to continue to proliferate. They offer much promise of a bright future.[15]

Writing in the Foreign Language Curriculum — Links to English Departments

Just as the bad news of American students' cultural myopia stimulated some foreign language departments to forge links with their colleagues in the social sciences, the bad news about students' writing skills spurred a reaction from some language faculty who saw that they could contribute significantly to the development of students' writing ability through a revised approach to the teaching of

composition in foreign language classrooms.

In the past, foreign language composition courses have often focused on sentence translation. As the courses progressed students translated longer passages. In this kind of course students sometimes read short pieces of literature and reviewed grammar systematically, but had little opportunity to express themselves in writing and then to redraft and polish their texts until they reached a minimum level of linguistic and stylistic acceptability, if not elegance. Directed or guided themes gradually became recognized as useful devices for teaching writing and newer grammar books offered them as homework options at the intermediate level. These kinds of assignments involved giving students a list of questions usually based on the text of the grammar lesson. The answers formed a composition of sorts. Their understandable desire to help students avoid making errors prevented many foreign language faculty from using techniques accepted by English composition faculty. However, during the 1970s as foreign language faculty moved toward aural-oral methods that permitted students more freedom in personal expressi... some faculty began to see the merit of offering more freedom in written assignments.

Over a period of time, some foreign language instructors began to teach composition by using a peer text editing method comparable to what was coming into favor in English writing courses.[16] The method does not concentrate solely on grammar errors but gives equal weight to four categories: grammar/vocabulary use, stylistic technique, organization of material, and content. In addition, much of the editing and revision of compositions is done by peers. As a result of this stress on peer collaboration, the instructor's role in class resembles that of the chairman of an editorial board. Students advise each other on ways to strengthen subsequent drafts of their work, and typically redraft each composition two or three times.

One example of the implementation of this method of teaching writing can be seen at High Point College in High Point, North Carolina. As part of an overall examination and revision of course content and teaching methodology, the language faculty decided to introduce the method in varying degrees at all levels of language learning, with short writing assignments occurring as early as the fourth week of the first semester. Just as in the lower levels, dramatic results also occurred at the upper levels in the Advanced Grammar and Composition courses.

At Oklahoma State University, a similar method was applied in a French composition course. Here, despite the great diversity among the students it was possible to create the atmosphere of an "editorial board" and produce definite improvement in writing skills and in style.

One of the most ambitious programs in foreign language composition is taking place at Georgia Southern College in Statesboro, where the "writing-to-learn" approach was begun in French in the winter quarter of 1982. This approach emphasizes writing as a basic tool to be used in both acquiring and utilizing knowledge in any field. At the elementary and intermediate levels, French faculty members have adopted the Swaffar cognitive process method. During the last fifteen minutes of a class, students compose one- to three-sentence summaries of a reading passage and share them aloud with classmates. This necessitates a four-step process of reading silently, writing in their own words in the target language, listening to each other's summaries, and discussing them. The next day, they review

more detailed oral/written exercises related to the passage.

A college grant is supporting a research project designed to support continuing research on foreign language. The area of focus is the final quarter of intermediate French. Students complete six writing assignments which require multiple drafts — two in English and two in French. To determine patterns of errors, the faculty member records errors made by individual students in both languages on all assignments. One goal of the study is to help faculty members use a descriptive — rather than prescriptive — approach when teaching grammar. The research will indicate which errors are generated by each writing assignment. In the future, grammar and syntax which is generated by a particular assignment will be reviewed prior to that assignment. Ultimately, the second goal is to indicate the effect of foreign language study on English literacy.

At the University of the Pacific in Stockton, California, the French for Business and Economics course stresses writing. Students compose letters, sales reports, problem analyses and related documents each week. They receive photocopies of each other's work for editorial comment during class. Each sample text is analyzed by students from the point of view of tone, level of discourse, effectiveness, use of vocabulary and idioms as well as for acceptable grammar and spelling. Students re-write all drafts. The faculty reports that students respond well to the challenge of addressing "real" business problems in their assignments and use their growing familiarity with the culture of their international business colleagues in handling the preparation of these texts.

In the past, despite the similarity in their graduate training and literacy interests, faculty in many English and foreign language departments in post-secondary institutions have been rivals. They compete for student credit hours, responsibility for literature-in-translation programs, and for increasingly scarce faculty and material resources. Lately programs like the ones featured above have begun to create links between the methods of the two curricula.

While foreign language faculty have begun to adapt methods developed in English writing programs, most English faculty have yet to discover how knowledgeable foreign language faculty can be about teaching students grammar and syntax. Since so many students come to post-secondary level in need of these skills, foreign language faculty have a great deal to offer their colleagues in English. The links now being forged may encourage others. All are likely to benefit from an atmosphere which leads to competent and creative use of language.

Part Two: Foreign Languages and the Professional Curricula

Introduction

While foreign language and literature faculty in some institutions have been establishing vital connections with social science and English curricula, others

perceived a more pressing need to link the study of foreign languages more specifically to career education. If the former connections aimed at improving the teaching and learning of culture and literacy skills, the links to professional programs were designed to respond to the student's question "What can I *do* with foreign languages?"

The development of specialized foreign language courses for careers represent one of the major trends in language study in America in the 1980s. The variety and scope of coursework available at large universities, and small liberal arts colleges as well as community colleges indicates that foreign language faculty have evidently responded to local needs and interests in developing their curricula. While many of these joint foreign language-careers programs are too new to have established significant professional placement records, it is clear that students do enroll in these courses. They do seem to understand specific answers to the questions about what to do with their language study.

Language training oriented toward careers and professions other than teaching was, of course, available in colleges and universities long before the erosion of language requirements compelled departments to rethink their programs in an effort to make them more relevant to students' interests. Textbooks in scientific German dating back to the 1930's and earlier can still be seen in departmental libraries, courses covering such materials were certainly available even earlier than that. In the 1940's, the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) in languages provided a classic instance of a professionally oriented immersion program. The fact that in this case the professions (or occupations) were concerned with military intelligence did not detract from the integrity of the instruction. Similarly, area studies and international studies programs, normally focusing on regions other than western Europe, promoted (and often required) the intensive study of languages like Arabic, Chinese, and Hindi and part of professional training for specialized careers dealing with the affairs of specific world areas.

Even in the 1950s and 1960s, when college language programs, from intermediate level on, were serving a menu consisting almost exclusively of literature, works of imagination were usually supplemented by short essays, excerpts from books or periodicals, and other non-fiction materials that had either cultural or literary value or both. Although most college and university faculty had their primary professional training in literature, they all had sufficient experience in the target culture to recognize and meet their students' need for factual information and guided understanding of the essential elements of that culture.

In the 1960s, college-level language requirements began to erode, careers in teaching became less attractive, and departments became painfully aware of their need to attract students into their classes who might have little or no interest in literature but conceivably some interest in a foreign language as a means of communication. The 1960s, a period of rapid growth in higher education (121% between 1960 and 1970), had also seen the advent of what was then, perhaps pretentiously, labeled "the new student," or more meaningfully, the nontraditional student, a catch-all-term intended to encompass both the new categories of students who were being sought out and admitted by traditional institutions, as well as those for whom new institutions were being established, primarily community colleges,

which quadrupled in population between 1963 and 1974. These students no longer fitted the classic mold of the American college student: they tended to be older and poorer, were often part of a traditionally disadvantaged group, and above all they were employed — in many cases, full-time. For such students, higher education played a different role in their lives than it had for their predecessors: college was not merely a stage in their life experience, it was also on-the-job, pre-vocational, or pre-professional training. For others, especially older people, it was enrichment, advancement, or expansion of an existing career.

Except at some of the selective universities, most language departments at institutions that had dropped or abridged their entrance and B.A.-degree requirements for foreign languages recognized a need for rapid and thorough reform of their programs at all levels. In particular they saw the need to revise and alter the image of their advanced courses and majors, in order to correct the erroneous assumption of students and their counselors that foreign language study was only useful for the study of literature and as preparation for a career in teaching. That this assumption, mistaken as it is, was still prevalent in the 1970s, and to a lesser extent even in the 1980s, is attributable both to the persistence of tradition and to the reality of language and literature programs as they were in the mid-1960s, when requirements were nearly universal. While enjoying the benefits of National Defense fellowships, rapidly growing enrollments, and an abundance of good teaching positions at all levels, departments saw no need to modify programs or concern themselves with their students' career objectives. The impetus to such questions and concerns came only with a decline in their fortunes.

Inevitably, the now famous question "What can I do with it?" was asked not only by students enrolled in foreign language courses but also by those who now had the choice of whether to study a language or not. Their interest in the question coincided with a prevailing attitude which placed greater value upon "career education" that upon the venerable but no longer "relevant" ideas of general education. The language profession's responses to this new career emphasis was evident in numerous articles, surveys, conferences, workshops, and statements concerned with demonstrating the usefulness of languages for careers and professions. Simultaneously, the profession sought to make the career connection tangible by developing actual courses and degree programs to cater to the supposed new, pragmatic interests of their students.[17]

BUSINESS

Foreign language study for business or commercial careers has grown faster than any other of the professionally oriented language programs.[18] Of course almost all institutions have experienced a rapid expansion of enrollments in business degree programs, so it is not surprising that a number of these students should elect to add a second language capacity to their preparations for careers in international business or in multicultural-multilingual settings in the United States. However, two more compelling reasons seem to be responsible for the bulk of this growth, even in schools that retain a language requirement or a strong liberal arts tradition.

International business has begun to express the need to hire persons with foreign language skills. In a survey done by John Hubbard and Robert Ristau,[19] companies doing international business indicated that all of the following were desirable in

future employees, and they ranked them in order:

(1) Business major with foreign language minor.
(2) Language and international trade program.
(3) Foreign language major with business minor.
(4) Foreign language major.

International business seems to favor a combination of the two. Economic conditions in the West since the 1973-74 oil crisis have certainly played an important role. Many business schools and foreign language departments surveyed have only recently (i.e., since 1973-74) tried to meet this new need by joint programs of all kinds. Only a few, such as the American Graduate School of International Management and the Monterey Institute of International Studies, have had joint programs for many years. Almost every other industrialized country expects business leaders to know a foreign language; the United States is only gradually moving in the same direction.

Foreign language business curricula have also been stimulated by the series or programs for language teachers developed by organizations in France, Spain, and Germany, which seek to promote European trade. France's Paris Chamber of Commerce began the promotion of commercial French for foreigners in the mid-1970s. It instituted an advanced French exam covering letter writing, economic geography, a commercial questionnaire, translation from the foreign language into French, and a dictation. Upon passing, candidates receive a diploma *(diplôme supérieur)* attesting to their high level of competence in using commercial French. In 1978 the Paris Chamber of Commerce added a lower-level test. That test includes letter writing, a commercial questionnaire, translation from French into the foreign language and from the foreign language into French, and reading comprehension. Successful candidates receive certificates *(certificats pratiques)* which attest to a functional level of competence. Third and fourth year foreign language students typically take the lower-level test, while advanced undergraduates and graduate students in French may more appropriately sit for the advanced exams.

For information on the French tests and on American testing centers, teachers may write to: Le Directeur, Relations Internationales, Enseignement, Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie de Paris, 14, rue Chateaubriand, 75008 Paris, France.

Teachers who want to prepare to teach commercial French may attend summer seminars of the Paris Chamber of Commerce especially designed for those without a business background: Professeur responsable des programmes de français pour étrangers, Centre de Formation Permanente, 79, avenue de la République, 75011 Paris, France.

Other seminars are available through the same organization for persons who have a business background. These seminars do not make the French teacher a business expert, but they provide enough sources of information to answer most questions when foreign faculty return home to prepare classes.

Some partial scholarship funding is available to a small number of those who attend the Paris seminars, but for those unable to attend there are several workshops held every year on this continent.[20]

Bibliographies of pertinent works are available from the Paris Chamber of Commerce or in *Commercial French*.[21] Several approaches to the subject were recently discussed in the short volume edited by Robert Crane, *American Programs and French Expertise*.[22]

In 1980, the Madrid Chamber of Commerce became interested in a similar testing program. Their lower-level exam *(nivel básico)* covers letter writing, commercial terminology, and business organization. The higher-level exam *(nivel superior)* tests not only the three areas of the lower-level exam, but also economic geography of Spain and Latin America, and business documents. For more information on the tests and American testing centers, contact: Sr. D. Alfonso Fernández Ruiz, Secretario General Adjunto, Cámara Oficial de Comercio e Industria de Madrid, Huertas, 13-1º, Madrid, Spain.

The Madrid Chamber of Commerce will send a bibliography of pertinent works to interested faculty. Another, edited by Geoffrey Voght, is available from ACTFL publications. Two of the American testing centers also provide bibliographic information.[23]

The Executive Council on the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP) is now considering a decision to create a Standing Committee on Spanish and Portuguese for Business and the Professions. In addition to programs run by the Madrid Chamber of Commerce, Eastern Michigan University held a conference on commercial Spanish in March, 1982. Another is scheduled there for April, 1983. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the Modern Language Association (MLA) often include commercial Spanish either by itself of with other languages in a commercial session.[24]

By late 1983 or early 1984, the Carl Duisberg Society, the Goethe Institute, the German-American Chamber of Commerce, and the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG) Committee on Business German will offer jointly a *Diplom Wirtschaftsdeutsch*. The test will resemble those in French and Spanish described above. Both the Carl Duisberg Society in Cologne and the Goethe Institute in Atlanta have offered preparation for faculty members who intend to teach German:

Carl Duisberg Gesellschaft e.V. Hohenstauffenring 30-32 D-5000 Köln 1 - W. Germany	OR	Carl Duisberg Society 425 Park Avenue New York, NY 10022
Goethe House 1014 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10023 (headquarters for German-American Partnership Program)	OR	Goethe Institute Atlanta 400 Colony Square Atlanta, GA 30361 (one of several local centers and the one hosting a 1981 business German colloquium)

The University of Rhode Island and Illinois State University at Normal have summer programs every year in commercial German for teachers and business personnel. They provide excellent preparation for those planning to teach the subject for the first time.

The Goethe Institute and the Carl Duisberg Society provides information on bibliography and on the future testing program. Other bibligraphies have been published in *Die Unterrichtspraxis*. Several approaches to the subject are covered in *Teaching Business and Technical German: Problems and Prospects*, edited by Kathryn Buck, Edward Fichter, and Kristin Helmers and published by the Carl Duisberg Society in 1981.[25]

Given the growing demand by international business and the more extensive opportunities for language teachers to become acquainted with business practices in France, Spain, Spanish America, and Germany, the current movement toward more commercial language teaching in French, German, Spanish and other languages will certainly continue. The vast majority of commercial French courses described in the literature tends to be aimed high enough to prepare students for the Paris Chamber of Commerce exams. Commercial Spanish and Commercial German courses are also geared to the intermediate and advanced levels, and as time progresses their course content will surely be affected by international exams.[26]

Review of Survey of Commercial Language Courses

Recently, a survey of foreign language and literature departments revealed that while only a small handful of schools offered commercial French, German, or Spanish ten years ago, over three-fourths of responding departments in four-year institutions currently teach or plan to teach business-related courses. A total of 450 questionnaires were sent to department and division chairmen at four-year colleges and universities, institutions selected at random from the MLA's *PMLA Directory*. Of these, 51.1% (230 of 450) responded. (Responses to 100 questionnaires sent to two-year colleges were too few to be considered statistically significant.)[27]

The results of the survey of four-year schools' programs were surprisingly positive:

	Responses	
Departments offering commercial or business language courses at present (including fall, 1982)	151	65.7%
Departments with plans for commercial language courses in the near future (definite and probable)	25	10.9%
Departments who neither have now nor plan to offer commercial language courses	54	23.5%

Among the departments which had no plans to offer such courses in the future, several gave explanations. Budgetary constraints were cited by six institutions, while two stated that they were remaining dedicated to the liberal arts. Four had tried but failed to gain course approval. Prestigious liberal arts institutions were divided more evenly or responded less frequently. While eight out of 20 departments surveyed in the Ivy League responded, only five of them offered commercial language courses. In addition, Princeton's Department of Romance Languages, which offers no formal commercial course, continues to help provide summer work experiences in France, as it has for the last 20 years. None of the three "Seven Sister" departments responding listed commercial courses, but Bryn Mawr mentioned cooperation with economics faculty in an International Economic Relations program.

Several departments which do not presently have commercial courses indicated that their business schools require some foreign language study. A number of institutions without immediate plans for commercial language courses also stated that they would "perhaps" offer them in the future.

The breakdown by language revealed the following figures for the 150 foreign

language and literature departments offering business-related courses:

	No. of departments
French	88
German	73
Spanish	75

These courses were given at a variety of different levels. Although the survey did not require that the levels be specified, the vast majority of respondents chose to indicate whether courses were elementary, intermediate, or advanced. Most courses listed were designed for third or fourth year college language students. Included in the above categories are courses labeled "business," "commercial," "for trade," "economic," "for business personnel or executives," "commercial correspondence," and "business translating."

While the survey was designed to elicit information on courses taught in French, German, and Spanish, a few voluntary responses from multilanguage departments indicated that business-related courses were also taught in other languages as well, specifically Japanese, Italian, Russian, Chinese, and Hungarian. Since the survey did not solicit information about these languages, the data on them cannot be regarded as meaningful for the sample of respondents.

In 38 departments, more than one commercial course was taught for a given language or languages. 40 of the 150 departments that already had one or two courses were planning to offer another course either in the same language or in other languages. Twenty-eight departments answering the questionnaire indicated that they offered technical and scientific language courses, and translation and interpreting programs.

Many institutions had received grants to establish or expand commercial language programs. The National Endowment for the Humanities funded fifteen, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) funded six, and the Office of International Education of the Department of Education funded 138 (not limited to business).[28] Other sources included state boards of education, private foundations, individuals' home institutions, and foreign governments.

Work experience in a business setting for foreign language students is becoming quite popular. Of the departments surveyed, 36 offer such an opportunity to their students. Another seven are trying to establish such a program. Cooperative education involved paid work, and internships usually unpaid experiences. Institutions place students both locally and abroad in all kinds of experiences.

Many respondents report a move toward greater cooperation with business schools, however a number of them lament that their business faculty and deans are unreceptive. Forty-seven did indicate a formal or semi-formal cooperation agreement, and five others hope to establish one. That cooperation ranges from joint degrees and joint placement for work experience to required or strongly recommended courses in the other field. Almost every institution that taught both foreign languages and business allowed or encouraged students to take both, but only those with a more definitive relationship are included in this count.

A wide variety of programs and courses now provides links between business and foreign language curricula. The great majority fall into at least one of three categories: (1) general links between business departments or schools and foreign language

departments, (2) business internship or cooperative education experiences, and (3) language courses with a business slant. Programs of these types will receive most of the attention of this section.[29]

Eastern Michigan University's Department of Foreign Languages offers both a graduate and an undergraduate program that fit all three categories linking business and foreign languages. Students at the undergraduate and Master's level may complete joint degree programs through a combination of foreign language courses and business school courses. With the help of an FIPSE grant, they implemented a cooperative education program that places foreign business school students in the United States and American students abroad. Eastern Michigan has even established a consortium to which several American institutions subscribe. Through the consortium, participating schools can send EMU qualified students to be placed in cooperative experiences abroad, and they can attract foreign cooperative students for placement in businesses in their area. Students participating pay a fee of $500 to $750. Several respondents indicated that they already were part of the EMU consortium or hoped to be in the future. Eastern Michigan prepares students in commercial French, German, and Spanish. Several courses in each are offered every year. In addition, EMU is a currently testing center for exams of the Paris and Madrid Chambers of Commerce. The Department plans to establish opportunities for business experience abroad for teachers of commercial French, German, and Spanish; and to become a testing center for commercial German as well.

The Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures at SUNY Stony Brook offers functional skills in the social sciences and natural sciences with functional skills in the social sciences and natural sciences which are different from the usual "Scientific German" courses in that they also require at least two years of previous language instruction. On the graduate level, the Department is offering a joint Doctorate of Arts in Foreign Language Instruction, together with the Departments of French and Italian, Hispanic Languages, and Linguistics. This degree is designed to provide advanced training in the teaching and application of foreign language skills. It is considered appropriate for specialists in language education, bilingual media and communications, marketing and other consultants. Graduates of the program have the option of going into university teaching or business, industry and government. The first graduate of the program joined the diplomatic corps in Germany. The degree is as rigorous as a Ph.D. in its requirements but, obviously, from the brief description given above, much more oriented toward the applied aspects of foreign languages.

In addition the Stony Brook Germanic and Slavic Languages and Literatures Deparment has developed, with funding from the Federal German Republic of Germany, one of the first complete publications on the teaching of Business German. The material, which was complete in 1980, has been adopted by a number of departments who found *Functional Skills for German in Business and Economy: A Curricular Guide and Materials for the Teaching of Business German* useful as the sole text for a one or two semester course or as a complement to other texts. The business German course, taught since 1979, requires at least two years of German and deals not just with the language aspects, but also the entire business climate in the Federal Republic and its relation to the European Economic Community. Such

aspects as employment and social insurance, transportation and communication, commerce and trade, money and banking, are included. The department has begun writing a program for Business German to be used on microcomputers, which have been part of the language instruction program for the past two years.

Three prestigious institutions with Master's programs in international business require fluency in at least one foreign language and provide internship experience in an international company. The institution most mentioned by other survey respondents was The American Graduate School of International Management, Glendale, Arizona. This institution has special program arrangements with Southern Methodist University, the University of Arizona, Drury College, the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Denver, and institutions in China, Japan, Mexico, England, Spain, and Germany. Graduates receiving their Master of International Management degree (M.I.M.) encounter little difficulty with job placement.

A second program, for the Master in International Business Studies (M.I.B.S.) at another institution, assures its students a working experience abroad: Master in International Business Studies, College of Business Administration, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

The third institution's program concentrates on internship experiences locally for students in international management: Department of Languages and Humanities, Monterey Institute of International Studies, Monterey, California. They offer not only French, German, and Spanish, but also commercial Chinese, Japanese, and Russian.

Sometimes the link between business and foreign languages is a university-wide project. The director of the Office of Cooperative Education at East Carolina University reports that her placements are not limited to business students and foreign language students, although both groups come under her wing. Her office publishes a newsletter about co-op experiences and the benefits both students and employers have derived from the program. The advantage of such an all-encompassing office is that it includes government employment as well as business. One of the more interesting placements for a foreign language student was with the International Affairs Division of NASA.

For further information in this area, see the booklet outlining over 1000 cooperative education programs prepared by the Cooperative Education Research Center of Northeastern University. It is available from: The National Commission for Cooperative Education, 360 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115.

Departments with Ph.D. programs in one or more foreign languages not only are beginning to teach commercial language courses, but they also offer applied tracks to Master's and Bachelor's students as well as opportunities to take international business exams. The Pennsylvania State University's French Department and German Department, for example, have both an M.A., a Ph.D., and an M.B.A., or an M.S. Their dual Master's degree with specialization in international business allows for a work-study component at the Université de Nice or in the Cologne foreign exchange program. It is also possible to obtain a Bachelor's degree in French and business at Penn State. The University of Cincinnati's German Department obtained a U.S. Department of Education grant to establish a certificate program in business German, and it participates in a five-year cooperative

education program for B.A. students. Cincinnati students may take part in the work-study program in Hamburg, Germany. Rutgers University's Department of Spanish was mentioned earlier as a center for exams of the Madrid Chamber of Commerce, and its Department of French has hosted a conference on the teaching of commercial French. The French Department also serves as a center for exams of the Paris Chamber of Commerce. The University of Illinois at Urbana reports a successful Commercial French Studies program combining French and business for undergraduates. The Ohio State University offers dual degree programs in a foreign language and business at the Bachelor's level and hopes to establish business/language internships in the future. The University of Iowa, which already has an applied French major, is trying to arrange both an exchange program with a French business school and a cooperative education program for the state of Iowa. At least ten other departments granting doctoral degrees who responded to our survey listed commercial course offerings. Some of them, such as Columbia, offered them infrequently and somewhat informally, while most, such as Harvard and the University of Pennsylvania, had more formal courses.

Several institutions, both public and private, indicated that some or all of their commercial courses were aimed at the adult population, sometimes as continuing education courses. North Shore Community College in Beverly, Massachusetts, taught General Electric workers French for the first time in 1982. With the help of an NEH grant for their "Foreign Language and Cross-Cultural Program," Central Virginia Community College launched a highly successful commercial language program for adults. The grant enabled them to devise cultural readers for PSI (Personalized System of Instruction) courses in Arabic, French, German, Portuguese, and Spanish. Many of the students come from local businesses and enroll part-time. Central Virginia tries to meet the needs of the business community and has at its disposition the skills of several four-year colleges in the area. Thus in response to one request from local industry they were able to hire a Danish instructor who normally teaches at Sweetbriar.[30]

Four-year institutions also try to meet the needs of the non-traditional student. Manhattanville College has a business Spanish program that recruits students who are now working in business as well as traditional undergraduates. Harvard University teaches business Portuguese to adults, and Gannon University offers commercial courses in several languages for adults. Colleges in locations with many companies doing business abroad accounted for most commercial language courses for non-traditional students.

Many departments reported that their undergraduate students who took commercial language courses had no trouble finding full-time employment after graduation. This was especially true for programs that combined formal business courses with commercial language courses. Montclair State College's French department offers commercial French, translation courses leading to certification, and instruction in interpreting. One brochure they sent included similar offerings in German and Spanish. According to their business French brochure, Montclair State French majors obtained employment with Peugeot, the Credit Lyonnais, and the United Nations among other places on a long list. Hofstra University's French department reports that all of their French majors with minors in international

trade have landed jobs in which they are using their French. Since its cooperation with the School of Business began, Hofstra's French Department has maintained 30-35 majors and 50-60 minors every year. The Department of French at the University of Illinois at Chicago has an even larger program which has had success in finding students work experience opportunities in the Chicago area before they graduate. At the University of Colorado at Boulder a program in International Spanish for the Professions offers courses and internships not only in business but also in several other professions. Good placement reports have also come from the Auburn University International Trade program and the North Carolina State University Business Management and Spanish program. While all of the above listed programs are fully established, others, like the new one at California State University at Fullerton (B.A. in International Business with concentrations in French, German, Portuguese, and Spanish) have only recently opened and are looking forward to comparable results.

Some of the links between business and foreign languages are specialized.

(1) The Department of Foreign Languages at the State University College of New York at Fredonia has a joint program with Cornell University's New York State College of Agriculture. It combines economics with business management oriented toward agriculture, and foreign language courses that suit the subject matter.

(2) Washington and Jefferson College's Department of Modern Languages and Classics has established an internship program with a French film producing company.

(3) The University of North Carolina at Charlotte authorized a scholarship for a student combining a program in French and business.

(4) The University of Pittsburgh offers translation internships in local businesses. Professional translators in those businesses sometimes serve as part-time instructors.

(5) The Governor of Missouri asked the German Department at the University of Missouri to help attract German business to the state. Because they are helping state government, the department has found support for commercial German easy to obtain from the University's higher-level administrators.

(6) Bethany College in West Virginia hosted a 1982 conference on The Global Marketplace. Government representatives, international business leaders, and educators participated and discussed international business throughout the world.

(7) Gannon University provides a certificate program for business majors.

(8) Internship or cooperative education experiences are available to several schools jointly in the state systems of Arizona, California, and New York.

(9) Guilford College has a required Interdisciplinary Studies program in which all freshmen visit a local industry with heavy overseas commitments.

(10) Arizona State University is using interviews with business person-

nel who have worked overseas to determine the foreign language needs of the business community.

(11) Bloomsburg State College has a five-year program leading to a B.A. in foreign languages and an M.B.A. at graduation.

(12) The Experiment in International Living just began a semester abroad in Rouen in International Commerce.

(13) Appalachian State University arranged an internship exchange program with the Québec Ministère des Affaires Intergouvernementales.

(14) Michigan State University accounts for 14 business internship fields, including four in engineering.

(15) University of Akron German students assist local businesses with foreign correspondence, and Akron students serve as interpreters for police and the courts. It is interesting to note that a number of programs combining business and foreign languages require both civilization and literature courses.

Non-Business, Professionally Related Foreign Language Courses

A number of departments included their translation programs and courses in the survey of business-related curricula.[31] These programs are now quite widespread, and the best of them include internships in business, law firms, or other professional settings. The program at the University of Pittsburgh is staffed by professional translations from the business community and is presently housed in the Spanish Department. Pittsburgh is considering the development of a certificate program in professional translation involving several departments and based on a proficiency test.

The University of Colorado, Boulder reports that its International Spanish for the Professions program draws excellent student enrollment and has success in placing its graduates in good jobs. Its translation courses are an important part of the program which allows for a variable credit internship for the professions.

The Georgia State University Foreign Language Department has offered a certificate program in translation and interpretation since 1979. The department reports that admission to the program is based on an achievement test in both English and the language of specialization. Following the prescribed courses, students must take an exit examination as well. An equally vigorous program in simultaneous interpretation presupposes completion of the translation sequence. A practicum is available.[32]

Montclair State College also reports a translating and interpreting program. After a two year foundation in the language and structures of contemporary France, the students pursue three courses in translation and one in simultaneous and consecutive interpreting. Students may pursue French, Spanish or German as a language specialty. The Spanish program provides opportunities for field work in

the Internship in Law program as well as with business and industries. In all languages, students may gain work experience in literary translation. Capitol University and Brigham Young also report translation internships.

Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology offers a technical Translator's certificate. This program is a four year minor in scientific and technical Russian or German with a major in some science or engineering program. The brochure for this degree states that it helps students understand the role graduates could play in society: foreign industrial intelligence; international technical trouble-shooting and service; global health and environmental protection; overseas technical marketing and sales; and international basic science research.

Translation-Interpretation programs are a natural link between the language departments and the professions. As these programs grow, faculty will need to supervise the quantity and quality of cultural materials that students are exposed to. Adequate proficiency testing is also essential to successful job placement of graduates. Faculty considering developing new programs or expanding existing ones will want to contact the American Translator's Association (109 Croton Avenue, Ossining, NY 10562).

Foreign language curricula related to the food industry have also developed. Students at the State University College of New York at Fredonia, may enroll in a new option linking French, German, or Spanish with agriculture. Under this program a student majors either in French, German, or Spanish at Fredonia for three years and then completes two years at New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Cornell University in one of the six specializations: agricultural economics, business management and marketing, public affairs management and resource economics.

The University of Houston's French Department has a program linking humanities with hotel and restaurant management. This cooperative program offers intensive language training and internship abroad in hotels, and also involves internships in Houston establishments, interviews with local professionals, and an intensive two-week course in language and contemporary civilization.

Funding Sources

Grant sources, including certain federal programs, have helped to support programs combining business and foreign languages. The U.S. Department of Education funded a University of Rhode Island proposal to develop business language courses and to foster closer relationships with international firms in the region. This department also funded a "curriculum strengthening proposal" at the University of North Carolina in Charlotte that allowed faculty released time for course development. At Tufts University it supported commercial language courses as part of an international studies grant. At the University of Cincinnati it helped establish a translation certification program. Still another federal grant funded released time for a University of Iowa professor to develop a cooperative education program in German. Many of the most successful programs mentioned earlier also received some kind of federal support.

Several institutions received interdepartmental grants: the State University of New York at Binghamton, West Virginia University, Harvard University, Miami University of Ohio, and the University of the Pacific. Alumni contributed funds for a foreign language business program at DePauw University. In most cases institutional funding was used for curriculum development and in one case for research in the business community.

Other sources of support included foreign governments and state departments of education. The French Cultural Services appointed a faculty member to teach "French for Business" at Louisiana State University in Baton Rouge. The New York State Department of Education funded the preparation of elementary business Spanish courses at Medgar Evers College — CUNY. In both cases, departments were serving the needs of the local business community.

The programs cited in this section may serve as points of departure for faculty who are developing or expanding their professional language offerings and need grant support. Since this kind of language teaching is a new field, most institutions are still trying to decide what kinds of programs suit them best. Many are exploring joint programs with business and the establishment of internship or cooperative education experiences for the first time. Foreign language departments are seeking funds from new grant sources, and it is likely that many more sources will be found, particularly in the private sector.[33] Private foundations have in the past supported different kinds of intensive language courses. Exxon, the Ford Foundation, and others have received commercial language grant proposals from several of the survey respondents. The private funds which applicants may receive and the kinds of programs which they implement will help to shape future links between business and foreign languages. Most grant-seeking faculty report that they began by a thorough search for likely sources of support for programs requiring funding.

Conclusion

This survey of business-related foreign language programs indicates that many commercial language programs now exist and that there are a number of joint programs between business departments and foreign language departments. It also reveals that foreign language faculty have pursued and received grant-funding for these programs. Several survey respondents thought their new programs were unique when in fact they were one of a dozen or more with very similar guidelines. Those teaching commercial language courses occasionally mentioned they felt isolated — they met with resistance from business faculty and, in rare instances, from foreign language colleagues who preferred a traditional curriculum. Three chairmen indicated that they wanted to offer a commercial language course but could find no faculty willing to teach it. Few departments have more than one commercial course in a given language, and the person teaching it probably has a degree in literature or linguistics. However, if there is a message from the three most startling conclusions above, it is that: programs combining foreign languages with business and other professions are becoming more and more commonplace; some of the finest programs in international business already include a strong foreign language component, and others

are planning to do so; many departments with strong liberal arts traditions now offer commercial language courses; and doctoral-granting institutions should be aware that persons working toward a Ph.D. in literature and linguistics today are far more likely to teach commercial language courses than were the Ph.D. recipients they prepared several years ago. The implications for these institutions are obvious.

The survey also reveals a predictable distribution of departments offering commercial language courses. State institutions showed the strongest support for this new area, as one might expect given that their mission statements often refer to the education of community leaders, and given that their state funds depend on how well legislators view their performance. Commercial language teaching is a good way to serve the public and to impress legislators with the benefits derived from foreign language study. "Seven Sister" Colleges showed the least support for commercial language teaching. Having been founded as highly selective liberal arts colleges for women, they rarely have business faculty. None of the three respondents offered a commercial language course, and fifteen "Seven Sister" departments did not answer the survey. The Ivy League and other private schools with a longer tradition in liberal arts did offer commercial language courses, but at a lower percentage rate than state institutions. Liberal arts institutions which had business faculty were more likely to offer commercial language courses than those which did not. Small private and public institutions either indicated that there was no funding for commercial language courses or that business language options had provided their programs with significant growth.

The movement toward commercial language courses has had significant impact on the teaching of international business and foreign languages. During the 1980s we can expect more professionally oriented courses, as well as an increase in the number of joint degree programs. Foreign language departments can be expected to expand the opportunities now available to gain work experience through internships and cooperative education. Without abandoning their traditional courses in literature, civilization and linguistics, foreign language departments are establishing links with the professional community that will help them grow throughout the decade.

A survey similar to the one done for business-related careers remains to be done for the allied health and legal professions. In addition, foreign language and literature faculty need to know how graduates of all these career-related language programs fare on the job market and on the job. We should anticipate information on the impact of internships abroad and in multicultural/multilingual business settings in the U.S. We need to learn whether current language proficiency levels adequately prepare students for their work and, just as importantly, whether they require more extensive knowledge of culture and literature than many revised programs now offer.

Part Three: Links Beyond the Institution

In addition to the curricular links between foreign language and literature departments and other sectors of their institutions, foreign language and literature departments have recently begun to establish links beyond the regular confines of the institutions they are a part of. These connections bode very well for the future. They

enable new constituencies to take language courses, and offer new resources for teaching traditional constituencies, and connect foreign language and literature faculty across academic sectors.

Links to New Constituencies

Immersion programs have been in place in a number of institutions, but at State University College of New York — New Paltz, the faculty has established an extensive program worthy of special note.[34] The program offers Arabic, Chinese, English, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Ukranian, and Yiddish and permits students to choose one of three formats: a two week Summer immersion program; Friday to Sunday weekend immersion programs during the academic year that offer fifteen hours of language instruction; and ten-day overseas immersion excursions. Elementary, intermediate, and advanced courses are taught to small classes of students from all walks of life and a wide variety of ages from high school students and faculty to retired people. The department reports enthusiastic reactions from the public and a significant impact on the regular foreign language academic program at SUNY — New Paltz. Ten immersion weekends were held in 1981 with over 600 enrollments. Two-week Summer immersion courses also enrolled more than 400 students who came from all over the U.S. and Canada. The program offered special recreational activities in addition to five hours of intensive language training per day. The department has begun to recruit and train high school language faculty to assist with the teaching of this growing program. The local and state press have covered the program extensively, and the university administration is pleased by the excellent publicity and fine use of university resources during the summer. Language faculty at New Paltz are encouraged by the developing excitement over languages, and are supplementing their salaries by teaching the additional sections which have resulted. Many universities could replicate this program.

At the University of Pennsylvania, Thomas Naff is carrying out a program using live interactive satellite based transmissions to teach language skills and culture. Naff states that this project is being carried out under the direction of the National Committee for Internationalizing Education through Satellites, a nationwide group of experts in the fields of language teaching, linguistics, area studies, curriculum development, educational media, satellite telecommunications broadcasting, and communications law. Naff describes the progress of the project in two stages: the development of a learning system model followed by an operational demonstration of the model employing both domestic and international satellite transmissions.

The learning system model has been developed using four guiding principles:

(1) language is the key to culture;
(2) the most effective way to teach language and culture is to place the student in the country where the language is spoken;
(3) owing to the ubiquitous presence of telecommunications throughout the world, it is possible to take advantage of the powerful visual orientation of students in the development of an effective learning/teaching model;

(4) through telecommunications it is possible to create an inculture learning experience by placing the student in live audio-video interaction with native speakers in a variety of their own cultural settings.

As presently designed, the model projects 15-20 hours of live interactive transmission per academic year to three groups of students. Initial tests on the model have so far confirmed the original hypothesis: use of a language in live interaction with native speakers in their native setting produces better learning more quickly, with greater retention of functional language skills, than traditional approaches. Moreover, there are indications the model will achieve another major goal: to contribute to the breakdown of cross-cultural stereotypes and misinformation.[35]

Other Universities that will participate are University of Southern California, University of Hawaii, University of Nebraska, Michigan State University, Syracuse University, University of Maryland, Florida International University, Howard University, George Mason University, and Middlebury College. Programs like this will help teach language better, overcome cultural stereotypes and expose foreign language students to technology they are likely to use in a variety of professions in the future.

Academic Articulation Links

Lack of collaboration among grade school, secondary, and post-secondary foreign language and literature faculty has often resulted in difficult transitions for students moving from high school foreign language classes to the college and university foreign language classes. The lack of communication between the foreign language faculty at the various educational levels has led to confusion over what students know or should know as they leave one level and progress to the next. It has caused difficulties for faculty in their efforts to ascertain students' proficiency levels and to organize effective classes as well as testing methods for students with varying levels of proficiency and preparation.

Rising traveling costs and shrinking departmental budgets in most educational institutions have placed a great strain on the availability of funds that permit large numbers of faculty to attend national language conventions. Many faculty cannot even attend regional language conferences unless their names appear in the program and they read a paper. To reduce costs, many college libraries have eliminated journal subscriptions to foreign language publications with low user frequency. In many areas, foreign language faculty teach increased loads because tight budgets have prohibited hiring, even where enrollments have increased. All these factors conspire to make information sharing more difficult just when it is most important for teachers to be well informed about new developments. For instance, the response to the President's Commission has encouraged a number of changes. The ACTFL-ETS Language Proficiency Testing Project has produced descriptors of sequential proficiency levels for each of the five skills; reading, writing, speaking, understanding, and culture. These must affect classroom teaching. Oral proficiency testing and improvements in the teaching of writing and reading will facilitate the development of language skills. Many institutions are restoring or increasing language require-

ments. To enable foreign language and literature teachers to become familiar with current trends in the field as quickly as possible, local associations of faculty modeled on county bar and medical societies, offer the most efficient cost-effective way to achieve on-going professional development, and create meaningful links among faculty teaching foreign languages from grade school to graduate school.

Like the societies of the other professions, local faculty associations act as an arena where their members can engage in continuous professional development on a monthly or bi-monthly schedule. Through numerous workshops, seminars, training courses, and regular society meetings, the members keep up-to-date on the latest developments in their fields without traveling great distances, without expenditures of scarce money and time. Most important, however, these associations serve as a vehicle where members of a profession can establish continuous dialogues, exchanges of ideas, methods, and developments, and create a critical mass of common interests and expertise. The existence of these local academic groups bears witness to the fact that, like doctors and lawyers, faculty can develop a sense of responsibility as a group for the level of professional practice by peers in their locale.

They also offer the additional benefit of unifying foreign language and literature teaching faculty of *all* academic sectors with a geographical area. For although doctors and lawyers do not segregate their professional meetings according to the level of elegance of their patients and clients, faculty do. Those teaching the same discipline and using largely the same methods have traditionally tended to stratify their professional meetings. Grammar and high school faculty do attend some state and national teachers meetings with their college and university colleagues, but often they attend different sessions. The sense of real collaboration and mutual respect across educational sectors is rare. Rare also is the spirit of group responsibility for the level of professional practice in a given locale. The academic profession remains rather fragmented along institutional lines. With notable exceptions, we have not tended to function as a group of professionals working together on a consistent basis for the professional development of ourselves and our colleagues.

Professional responsibilities include, along with the obligation to produce some research work, the obligation to provide the best foreign language and literature education to students and the best continuing professional education for fellow teachers. The establishment of collaborative professional development groups enables faculty to achieve both: integrated foreign language and literature programs that meet monthly or bimonthly and include faculty from all levels, initiate dialogues with other teachers, and organize programs that provide continuity in foreign language and literature programs for students. The professional update teams serve as arenas for the exchange of methodologies, materials, and means of testing, and like county medical and bar associations, they keep members up to date on current literature, trends, approaches, and events. These groups meet the specific needs of the local members and help teaching faculty in the same area solve their special problems through collaborative efforts. Most importantly, however, they help strengthen the commitment of foreign language teachers to their own on-going development, the needs of their students, each other, and their discipline.

Of course, in many cities like Boston, for example, on-going professional develop-

ment for foreign language and literature faculty has functioned well for years, and therefore, the model defined here may seem superfluous. In some states, twice yearly meetings of foreign language teachers are well planned and well attended. These are facts to celebrate. Where this is not the case, and those areas are numerous, the model of the county medical and bar associations may prove to be a useful approach to on-going professional development.

A grant program funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities has undertaken to launch eighty professional development centers for foreign language faculty in 1982-83. As the centers become operative and begin to hold meetings and issue reports, faculty will have a better idea of the contribution they can make. As this Report goes to press, on-going centers that have functioned for one year or longer include those in North Carolina (contact: Arlene Malinowski, North Carolina State University, Raleigh); in Aptos, California (Bette Hirsch, Cabrillo College); in Virginia (Charles Byrd, Emory and Henry College). These colleagues and others like them will provide a nucleus of information on what is expected to be a rapidly growing national movement.[36]

Conclusions: "Les Liaisons Dangereuses"

It is no secret that in many institutions the number of students taking literature courses in foreign languages has decreased dramatically in the last few years, even while enrollments in English literature courses, in some cases, have held steady. There is some danger that the links to International Education and to professional areas described above may further erode enrollments in foreign language courses in literature. If in our haste to respond to new challenges we forget our responsibilities to expose students to the great ideas and some of the major texts of their Western cultural heritage, we will have done grievous damage to their education. Of course, as more students develop a real capacity to use their second language well, and perhaps even perceive a long-range use for it in their professional lives, they may well be motivated to turn again toward literature courses, where they meet the great ideas and characters that form a crucial part of our national heritage and the human cultural treasury. Perhaps also, as students find encouragement of their career goals in their foreign language and literature course sequences they will seek personal development through a literature course.

Should students return to foreign language courses in literature now, they would find that relatively less experimentation has occurred in the teaching of literature than in the areas discussed in the preceeding pages. Perhaps the literature curriculum has always been well-designed and well-taught in foreign languages. This is, after all, the subject matter that most post-secondary faculty have prepared to teach. We suspect, however, that while some truly inspiring courses continue at some institutions, many foreign language faculty teach watered-down versions of their own graduate literature courses to their current undergraduate students. Teaching literature well is a crucial part of the mission of foreign language departments. The profession needs a national survey on the quality, content and form of curricula in literature in foreign language. The renaissance occurring elsewhere in foreign language programs must be stimulated in the area of literature.

As this 1983 *Reports* goes to press, the committee has learned of an imaginative literature program begun recently at Linfield College. The foreign language and literature department has an NEH grant project which has permitted the faculty to launch a new literature sequence called Modern Drama. Thirty students meet Monday, Wednesday, and Friday to read and discuss French, German, and Spanish plays in translation and meet Tuesday and Thursday in three smaller groups according to language specialty. In the foreign language classes, students read and discuss other plays in the original languages. Selection of plays and authors is, of course, carefully coordinated. Students may take only the M-W-F sequence, though very few do. The syllabus covers a wide range of works, both continental and Third World. The whole department is engaged in teaching the combined sequences so the impact on faculty development is significant. Students express high satisfaction with the courses despite its demanding five day schedule.

Successful new (or old) courses in literary criticism appear to be rare. It would seem that this is an area that would create natural links between foreign language and literature and philosophy department faculty. For instance, they might well join together to create a course exploring epistemology and using literary and critical texts as illustrations. Undergraduates in a wide range of majors and career directions would benefit from the exposure both to the history of ideas and to the texts they would read in a course designed to sharpen their own critical/analytical skills. Of course, literature and critical analysis should be (and are) incorporated into many of the courses currently linking foreign language and literature study with other segments of post-secondary education. Courses on culture as well as those oriented toward business and the professions should include readings in literature and criticism along with other texts.

If the loss of focus on literature and criticism poses one danger, foreign language requirements pose another. Requirements have been restored or strengthened in many institutions including the prestigious institutions such as Stanford and Yale as well as Indiana, Iowa, and North Carolina and many smaller colleges across the country. Will the profession insist on high quality programs that set and achieve realistic goals? Will we insist that students in required courses meet measurable levels of language proficiency and achievable standards of global awareness? Or, once the students are back in language classes will many departments lose their impetus to nurture these skills? In short, the danger lurks in the success of the department in making itself again part of the central curriculum. Quality of instruction must remain excellent and continue to *improve*. Faculty must also help students to retain their language proficiency. For instance, each course should offer students a long-range listening and reading list of books, articles, or tapes that will enable students to maintain their skills after the course concludes. The profession needs to remain aware of the crucial link between the foreign language classroom and the rest of the students' lives. The language training that the faculty nurtures should remain a positive part of their students' life-long learning.

Despite these dangers, the foreign language profession is in a better position to affect education today than at any time in the past twenty years. The new links we have described bode very well for the future. The connections to other academic departments, to new delivery systems, and to colleagues across the educational spectrum are

likely to grow. More people will be studying foreign languages. More broadly based course content and competency based methods will yield students who retain better memories of their language and culture training and a better capacity to use it in their personal and professional lives. The optimistic note on which we end this Report is predicated on the continuing and growing commitment of foreign language faculty to excellent classroom teaching, the careful proliferation of the kinds of links we have described in each section, and wisdom in dealing with the dangers that accompany growth. We are hopeful.

Notes

1. The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) has provided major support to language departments in the process of change. Seventeen foreign language and literature consultants have worked with more than 200 departments since 1977 on projects related to development of foreign language and literature and International Education. Pilot and implementation grants have supported the growth and expansion of projects many of which subsequently became models for other institutions. Summer institutes have permitted teachers to improve their skills, open new areas of expertise and share their knowledge. The NEH-Exxon Education Foundation Workshop for Development of Foreign Language and Literature Programs has assisted over 200 departments to revise curricula, improve management techniques, develop grants and other resources, and revitalize professional networks for foreign language and literature faculty.

NEH has also sponsored important handbooks such as Renate Schultz's *Options for Undergraduate Foreign Languages Programs* (New York: MLA, 1979). The reverberations of each of these efforts have helped immensely in creating a new sense of direction in the foreign language and literature field.

2. Humphrey Tonkin took special responsibility for this part on links to social sciences.

3. Richard D. Lambert, "Language Learning and Language Utilization," *ADFL Bulletin*, 13, No. 1 (1981), pp. 7-11: commenting on the standard arguments for language learning, Lambert states (p. 8), "I do not want to disarm these arguments entirely, only to suggest that they are decreasingly persuasive and that they have diverted our attention from another class of purposes for foreign languages so that they can use them."

4. See Connor 1977, Geno 1981, Schultz 1979, Strasheim 1981, Torney-Purta 1982, Born and Buck 1978.

5. See Bonham, *The Great Core Curriculum Debate*, 1979.

6. See President's Commission 1979, U.S. Office of Education 1979, Hanvey 1975, Bonham, *Update*, 1979.

7. See Bonham, *Update*, 1979.

8. See H. Ned Seelye, *Teaching Culture: Strategies for Foreign Language Educators* (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1974); Robert C. Lafayette, ed., *The Cultural Revolution in Foreign Language Teaching: A Guide for Building the Modern Curriculum* (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1975).

9. See Donald H. Bragaw, Helene Loew, and Judith S. Wooster, "Global Responsibility: The Role of the Foreign Language Teacher," in Geno 1981, pp. 47-89, for a particularly good overview of the subject.

10. On the Hampton Institute program see Clark 1982.

11. Council on Learning, *Education for a Global Century: Handbook of Exemplary International Programs*, (New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1981), pp. 14-15.

12. Dell Hymes, "Linguistic Aspects of Comparative Political Research." *Methodology of Comparative Research*, (New York: The Free Press, 1970), pp. 296-341: Hymes describes some of the pitfalls and makes a strong case for the awareness of the linguistic dimension on the part of social scientists.

13. See O'Maley and Jurasek 1982.

14. See Lambert 1981.

15. This committee wishes to thank Monica Casey for the valuable assistance she rendered in carrying out the research for this part of our work. We also thank the numerous individuals who provided Ms. Casey with information on current programs and programs in the planning stage.

16. Claire Gaudiani, *Teaching Writing in the Foreign Language Curriculum*, (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981).

17. It is useful to distinguish among four different kinds of response to the pressures for career-oriented curriculum: generic career courses specific career course, immersion courses, and career majors (or double majors). Examples of all four can be found in the largest extant compendium of language department curricula, the Modern Language Association's *Options for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Cultures*, compiled by Warren C. Born and Kathryn Buck (New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1978). Based on a comprehensive, non-evaluative, voluntary survey of all college and university language departments in the U.S., the compendium presents short factual reports on 1,682 courses and programs reported in 1974-75 by 690 different departments. Since the survey was never updated, it can in no sense be regarded as current, but it can nevertheless be taken as a fair representation of curriculum in 1974-75, and, given the natural limitations of the discipline and of faculty ingenuity, it can also be taken as fair representation of the range of possibilities in a language department curriculum.

Further, one whole division of the MLA's compendium is devoted to career-related courses and programs, offering a total of 512 entries in this category, of which the largest single subgroup (129 entries) related to business and commerce. Of the others, some relate partly to business (e.g., translator training), but do not necessarily fall into that category; others can clearly be identified as professional. Following the editors' classification scheme, the fields —excluding business — represented in the MLA compendium, and the number of reports for each, are the following: Translation and Interpretation, 65; Training for Bilingual Classrooms, 32; Research (Scientific, Technical, Social Sciences, etc.), 64; Etymology (e.g., Greek and Latin elements in scientific terminology), 15; Health Professions, 71; Law Enforcement, 38; Social Services, 42; Performing Arts, 16; Miscellaneous, 42.

A closer examination of this survey entries reveals an interesting range of careers and professions served, including some that would be regarded as "white-collar," others as "blue-collar," and others that serve many groups on the professional spectrum. Thus, some institutions offer a course in Spanish exclusively for nurses, some design it for a wider range of medical and paramedical workers, and others open the course to all medical personnel, including M.D.s and medical students; general, undifferentiated courses in translation techniques coexist with highly developed programs for the professional training of translators and interpreters; Spanish for farm and ranch workers can be found together with French for architects, Spanish for TV and radio broadcasters, German for research, and many other similar categories.

18. Patricia Cummins took special responsibility for this section of Part Two of this Report.

19. John R. Hubbard and Robert A. Ristau, "A Survey of Bilingual Employment Opportunities in International Trade," *Foreign Language Annals*, 15 (1982), pp. 15-21: For a complete copy of the report "Employment Opportunities in International Trade (on which the article is based), send $1.00 for postage and handling and a self-addressed 9 inch by 12 inch envelope to the Department of Foreign Languages, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197.

20. Three commercial French conferences have been hosted by the Fédération Internationale des Professeurs de Français, and one sponsored by Purdue University and the French Cultural Services took place in 1982. The C.C.I.P. Directeur des Relations Internationales, whose address is given in note 22, is usually aware of any conferences on the subject in United States.

21. Patricia W. Cummins, *Commercial French*, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982).

22. Robert Crane, ed. *Commercial French: American Programs and French Expertise*, (Paris: Haut Comité de la Langue Française and the Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie de Paris, 1982). Distributed by: Directeur des Relations Internationales, Enseignement, C.C.I.P., 14, rue Chateaubriand, 75008 Paris, France.

23. Rutgers University distributes detailed information on the exam and how to prepare for it. The person in charge is Professor Micaela Misiego, Dept. of Spanish and Portuguese, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903. Professor Geoffrey Voght at Eastern Michigan University has a second brochure on exams: Dept. of Foreign Languages, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI 48197. Please include $1.00 for postage and handling when writing to either school.

24. Special thanks to Geoffrey Voght of Eastern Michigan University and Carlos Badessich of the College of St. Thomas who provided information on the Spanish exams.

25. Special thanks to Kriemhilde Livingston of the University of Akron who supplied documentation not only on her own program but on bibliography, commercial programs elsewhere, teaching methodology, and seminars for teachers. The Committee also expresses appreciation to Axel Claesages of West Virginia University, Hal Rennert of the University of Florida, and Raymond Schaub of Eastern Michigan University who added bibliography and information on future testing and seminars planned by the Carl Duisberg Society.

26. The German Department at the University of Georgia now has one business German course. In response to the survey question about future plans, they answered that they are considering a sequel to the introductory course to prepare for a future *Diplom Deutsch als Wirtschaftssprache*. This type of reaction is likely to be typical as departments try to cover all test areas.

27. Although their telephone replies may be included in the kinds of programs described in Part Three of the Report, half of those supported by federal grants were not counted in the survey, either because they were not in the random sample or because they did not respond. I also noted that some departments, whose faculty members have written articles and presented convention papers on their commercial language courses, did not return the questionnaire.

28. Thanks are due to Janice Litwin of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Susanna Easton of the Office of International Education of the Department of Education, and Richard Henc'rix of the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education for information on grants made by their agencies. About half of the grantees they listed did not participate in this survey.

29. Other programs include business as an important component of an international relations program, or of a specialization in translating and interpreting, or of a combination with another profession. The professions mentioned most frequently were law, journalism, hotel management, the travel industry, and the health professions. Those areas are covered elsewhere in this Report.

30. For a packet of information on this grant project, send $1.00 for postage and handling to: Professor Eduardo Peniche, Dept. of Foreign Languages, Central Virginia Community College, P.O. Box 4098, Lynchburg, VA 24502.

31. For further information on these courses contact the modern language departments: North Dakota State University at Fargo, California State College at San Bernardino, California State College at Long Beach, University of Akron, University of Illinois Champaign — Urbana (French).

32. For more information contact: Dr. Marion L. Kuntz, Chairman, Foreign Language Department, Georgia State University.

33. The West Virginia Humanities Foundation (funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities at the state level) awarded a grant to West Virginia University to host a 1983 conference on business and the humanities. The objective of NEH in supporting such a conference is to convince business that the humanities have much to offer and that business in turn should support the humanities. International business and the importance of foreign languages will be included as one component.

34. For further information contact Professor Henry Urbanski.

35. Dr. Thomas Naff supervises this project and supplied the information included in this section.

36. For further information write, Claire Gaudian:, Project Director, "Strengthening the Humanities Through Foreign Language and Literature Studies," 210 Logan Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Bibliography

Bonham, George W., ed. *The Great Core Curriculum Debate*. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1979.

Bonham, George W. "What Global Knowledge Is Enough?" *Update I*, Council on Learning, Fall 1979.

Born, Warren C., and Kathryn Buck, ed. *Options for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Culture*. (New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1978).

Connor, Maurice W. "New Curricular Connections." In June K. Phillips, editor. *The Language Connection: From the Classroom to the World*. The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series, 9. (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1977), pp. 95-121.

Council on Learning. *Education for a Global Century: Handbook of Exemplary International Programs*. (New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1981).

Crane, Robert, ed. *Commercial French: American Programs and French Expertise*. (Paris: Haut Comité de la Langue Française and the Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie de Paris, 1982).

Cummins, Patricia W. *Commercial French*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.

Dodge, James W. "Educational Technology" in *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions*, Thomas H. Geno, ed., 1980 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1980), pp. 99-119.

Educators Handbook and Software Directory. Vanloves Publishers, 1982.

Gaudiani, Claire. *Strategies for Development of FLL Programs*. (New York: MLA Publications, (Spring) 1983).

Gaudiani, Claire. *Teaching Writing in the Foreign Language Curriculum*. (Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981).

Geno, Thomas H., ed. *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration*. 1981 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1981).

Hanvey, Robert. *An Attainable Global Perspective*. (New York: Center for Global Perspectives, 1975).

Harrison, John S. "Applications of Computer Technology in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning" in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner*, Robert G. Mead Jr., ed., 1982 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1982), pp. 143-151.

Hubbard, John R. and Ristau, Robert A. "A Survey of Bilingual Employment Opportunities in International Trade." *Foreign Language Annals* 15, 1982, pp. 15-21.

Hymes, Dell H. "Linguistic Aspects of Comparative Political Research." *Methodology of Comparative Research*. (New York: The Free Press, 1970), pp. 296-341.

Lambert, Richard D. "Language Learning and Language Utilization." *ADFL Bulletin*, 13, No. 1 (1981), pp. 7-11.

O'Maley, Patty, and Jurasek, Barbara. "International Education at Earlham." *Journal of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs*, Spring 1982, pp. 13-14.

President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November, 1979).

Schultz, Renate A. *Options for Undergraduate Foreign Language Programs*. (New York: Modern Language Association, 1979).

Seelye, H. N. *Teaching Culture: Strategies for Foreign Language Educators*. (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1974).

Strasheim, Lorraine A. "Broadening the Middle School Curriculum Through Content: Globalizing Foreign Languages." *Action for the 80s: A Political, Professional, and Public Program for Foreign Language Education*. The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1981), pp. 129-45.

Torney-Purta, Judith. "Global Education: An Area for Fruitful Collaboration Between Foreign and Social Studies." In ACTFL, *Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Priorities, November 1980*.

A Bibliography for International Education

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. *Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Priorities, November 1980*.

Berryman, Sue, and others. *Foreign Language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1979.

Bonham, George W., ed. *The Great Core Curriculum Debate*. New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1979.

——— "What Global Knowledge Is Enough?" *Update 1*, Council on Learning, Fall 1979.

Born, Warren C., and Kathryn Buck, ed. *Options for the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Culture*. (New York: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1978).

Brod, Richard I., ed. *Language Study for the 1980s*. (New York: Modern Language Association, 1980).

Burn, Barbara. *Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education*. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980).

Clark, Beatrice S. "The Infusion of African Cultural Elements in Language Learning: A Modular Approach." *Foreign Language Annals*, 15 (1982), 23-28.

Conner, Maurice W. "New Curricular Connections." In June K. Phillips, ed. *The Language Connection: From the Classroom to the World*. The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series, 9. (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1977), pp. 95-121.

Council on Learning. *Education for a Global Century: Handbook of Exemplary International Programs*. (New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1981).

DuVerlie, Claud, and Alan S. Rosenthal. "How to Prosper During a Foreign Language Crisis." *ADFL Bulletin*, 12, No. 1 (1980), 17-22.

——— "Climbing the Ladder of Institutional Priorities." *ADFL Bulletin*, 12, No. 2 (1980), 4-7.

Geno, Thomas H., ed. *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration*. 1981 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1981).

Hanvey, Robert. *An Attainable Global Perspective*. New York: Center for Global Perspectives, N.D. (1975).

Hymes, Dell H. "Linguistic Aspects of Comparative Political Research." In Robert J. Holt and John E. Turner, ed., *Methodology of Comparative Research*. (New York: The Free Press, 1970), pp. 296-341.

Lambert, Richard D. "Language Learning and Language Utilization." *ADFL Bulletin*, 13, No. 1 (1981), 7-11.

Missionary Training Center of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. *Culture for Missionaries: Hong Kong, Taiwan*. (Provo, UT: MTC, 1980).

Muller, Robert, *The Need for Global Education*. Philadelphia: Global Interdependence Center, N.D.

O'Maley, Patty, and Barbara Jurasek. "International Education at Earlham." *Journal of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs*, Spring 1982, 13-14.

President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1979).

Santoni, Georges. *Contemporary French Culture and Society*. (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1982).

Schultz, Renate A. *Options for Undergraduate Foreign Language Programs*. (New York: Modern Language Association, 1979).

Simon, Paul. *The Tongue-Tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis*. (New York: Seabury Press-Continuum, 1980).

Sims, William D., and Sandra B. Hammond. *Award-Winning Foreign Language Programs*. (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1981).

Strasheim, Lorraine A. "Broadening the Middle School Curriculum Through Content: Globalizing Foreign Languages." In June K. Phillips, ed., *Action for the 80s: A Political, Professional, and Public Program for Foreign Language Education*. The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1981), pp. 129-45.

Tonkin, Humphrey. "Language and International Studies: Closing the Gap." *ADFL Bulletin*, 13, No. 1 (1981), 13-20.

Tonkin, Humphrey, and Jane Edwards. *The World in the Curriculum: Curricular Strategies for the 21st Century*. (New Rochelle, NY: Change Magazine Press, 1981).

Torney-Purta, Judith. "Global Education: An Area for Fruitful Collaboration Between Foreign Language and Social Studies." In ACTFL, *Proceedings* (see first entry above), pp. 35-38.

United States Office of Education. *Task Force on Global Education: Report with Recommendations*. (Washington, DC: USOE, 1979).

Valencia, Pablo, and Franca Merlonghi. *En Contacto: A First Course in Spanish*. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1980).

Vicki Galloway
South Carolina Department of Education

Foreign Language and the "Other" Student

Introduction

Once upon a time, three-fourths of those who attended high school went on to college. The high school was a college preparatory school, boasting of a rigidly uniform but demanding curriculum. Attendance was not compulsory, and those who could not progress in the system simply dropped out. The students were a fairly homogeneous lot, children of affluent families, looking forward to respectable futures in the learned professions (perhaps teaching) or to leadership in politics or trade. They were, for the most part, the "chosen," endowed with intelligence and blessed with opportunity.

We know these students. One hundred years later they are still sitting in our foreign language classrooms. Unfortunately, however, they are sometimes the only ones.

The years have not passed gracefully. Against the social background of growth and change the entire character of the high school and its function have become severely altered. If it is still preparatory, it is so only in the broadest sense of the word — not only for college, but for life. No longer purely the domain of the urbane and the decorous *beau monde*, it now caters to a massive assemblage of individuals of every conceivable shade of intelligence, background, means, interest, expectation, and talent. Today's curriculum has displayed great strides in acknowledging, accepting, and respecting the diversity of these students; yet, the challenge remains:

> The present diversity of instruction in the high school reflects dimly like a clouded mirror the diversity of our society itself and it will not be adequate until it catches the image more exactly.[1]

This is a challenge we, as foreign language teachers, should take personally.

What Do We Believe?

Having sat in the elective chair for at least the past decade, the foreign language teacher can attest to the precarious existence it affords — an existence subject to the whims of a seemingly unsupportive administration which, reluctant to perform the *coup de grâce*, witholds nourishment through disregard and indifference. Is there one

among us who has not heard the administrator speak

about money: "We are met with a dilemma . . . when we contemplate funding for any program that a *small percentage of our students* want and the study of foreign language is one of them."

about time: "Whether we can justify *taking the time* from teaching basic English communication skills to teach basic communication skills in a foreign language is indeed a perplexing question . . . "

and about student needs? "I believe foreign languages are very important and should be offered in the high school curriculum but . . . other courses have higher priority. Selection of courses in foreign language, I believe, should be made *based upon the degree to which courses can meet the needs of the student body and the community.*"[2] (Emphasis added.)

The message is clear: It is unlikely that any program limited in service to 15% of the student population will ever be considered an administrative priority. Selectivity can be life-threatening.

In a series of interviews with foreign language teachers from thirteen public school districts within the Northwestern Pennsylvania area, Potoker[3] discovered that foreign language teachers were not unwilling to break out of the comfortable "college-bound" mold. It was the consensus of these teachers that no studnt should be discouraged if he or she expresses a desire to study a foreign language. In only one of the districts studied, however, was foreign language listed for something other than a college preparatory program.

The notion of "foreign language for everyone" has thus been greeted with varying degrees of eagerness by the foreign language profession — from enthusiasm and resolve, to timorous and hesitant acceptance, to the defeated cynicism conveyed by the familiar words, "I tried it, it didn't work":

> Well, no — I don't think foreign language is for everyone. It's a nice thing to say, but it just doesn't work in practice. There are many students who just can't learn another language. Of course I'd like large enrollments, but I just can't hold up the rest of the class while the slower students try to catch on. Besides, it's not fair to allow such students to face potential failure. If we know they can't handle it, it's better not to let them try.

All too often, when foreign language educators think of "fitting into the system" it is in terms of establishing an appropriate and comfortable niche. Yet, effective schools are not so tightly compartmentalized — either in terms of isolated disciplines or student populations. A summary of thirty-three research reports on school effectiveness concludes that one of the five characteristics of school effectiveness most frequently cited is that of "high expectations for student success." Of the teacher characteristics mentioned, the following stand out: "know your pupils," "expect to be

able to teach all children," and "have high expectations for all pupils." Of instructional characteristics, the following are quoted: "Instruction is addressed to the student's current needs," and "each student is challenged and expected to develop to the fullest of his or her capacity, regardless of background or disabilities."[4]

The 1970 *Northeast Conference Reports* chapter on "Foreign Language for All Students" issued among its key propositions the following:

(1) Second language learning should be an integral part of the basic education of every child.

(2) The humanizing experience of foreign language study should be available to every student at all levels of instruction.

(3) The concept of foreign language study for all children necessitates a new orientation for students, parents, counselors, administrators, and the foreign language teachers themselves.[5]

Acknowledging the difficulties inherent in the acceptance of these goals, the authors state:

> We are not unmindful of the many problems — budgetary, curricular, and other — that a commitment to the goal of foreign languages for all students brings with it . . . It may well be, however, that the first step — making this commitment — is the hardest of all for a school to take, and that once it is taken, avenues for putting it into practice will suggest themselves in ample number.[6]

This Report will presume such a commitment by viewing foreign language study in terms of the multi-strata composition of today's high school. It is devoted to the learner we often fail to recognize or understand and whose potential we often ignore — the invisibly handicapped learner, who, for whatever reason, is not success-prone. Specifically, it will address the socially disadvantaged and learning disabled youth of our schools in terms of their assets and weaknesses in the foreign language classroom, examining the extent to which their handicapping condition as identified by the educational system in general has significance for foreign language learning in particular. It is a call for research and experimentation, for, according to Strasheim, "A major factor in the enormous attrition rates today has to be that teachers, in their efforts to retain foreign language offerings, have recruited students they cannot really help or motivate . . . "[7] Twelve years have passed since the issuance of the previously-cited Northeast Conference Report. Yet, the answers are still not with us. Perhaps we have yet to ask the right questions.

The Low Achiever

> The task of the high school is not merely to speed the bright boy to the top. It is at least as much (so far as numbers are concerned far more) so to widen the horizons of ordinary students so that they, and still more, their children will encounter fewer of the obstacles that cramp achievement . . . Something . . . is needed which, by meeting them halfway, will lead them out and beyond themselves.[8]

Most foreign language teachers are quite prepared for the classroom as long as their students bear the following characteristics:

(1) they range in age from 14-21;

(2) they possess average to above average intelligence;
(3) they are self-motivated;
(4) they are high achievers; and
(5) they know what a direct object is.

Hence, students, based on their degree of compliance with the above criteria, are generally tri-categorized by the teacher as "the good students," "the slower students," and the "slow students," often referred to as "the hard core 20%."

Who are these "slow" students? Unless the learners have physical handicaps which bring their special needs to the fore, it is often quite difficult for the foreign language teacher to discern specific learning problems. Yet, the students whose performances are not as quick or as good as their classmates' may have one or more of a myriad of diagnosed or undiagnosed learning impediments. Many of these difficulties, while requiring relatively little in compensatory strategies, may be tremendously debilitating if not accomodated by curricular and instructional adaptation. Depending on the types of handicaps they encounter, teachers will be faced with the challenge of examining the adequacy of curricular content, altering teaching strategies, and modifying materials and enviroment, for as Stanford states:

> When Eli Whitney invented the assembly line process of manufacturing, he designed it for making rifles, not educating children . . . over recent decades, American schools have come to function more and more like assembly lines, with inputs and outputs and quality controls — and rejects . . . No Detroit automakers would attempt to build Cadillacs or Cordobas on an assembly line designed for Fords.[9]

The passage of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act increased the number of atypical students in regular high school classes. At present, four years after its implementation, 70% of all school-age handicapped children attend regular classes[10] and are allowed under law to have available to them "the variety of educational programs and services available to non-handicapped children."[11]

The foreign language teacher seldom sees the individual with real learning problems; yet, because we do not see them certainly does not mean that they do not exist in great number. In many states, the number of mildly mentally retarded and learning disabled students alone far exceeds the total state foreign language enrollment. These students are definitely present but most of them do not take our classes. Why? Everything seems to point to our reputation.

According to McCoy,[12] even the average to above-average student perceives foreign language study as threatening and anxiety-producing. From numerous small group sessions held with college students in first year Spanish classes, the author collected a list of sources of student anxiety: (1) the reputation of language classes for failure and poor grades, (2) peer derision and criticism, (3) previous unsuccessful language learning attempts, and (4) unclear goals and requirements. If it is recognized that these fears are present in the highly-motivated student of above average intellect, one can well imagine their magnification in the less able learner whose poor self concept and history of failure are very real.

The easiest solution would be to screen out the "unsuccessfuls" — they frighten us. They are difficult to reach because they do not seem to learn as easily or as well or in the same way as the other students. In Potoker's survey, although no teacher favored

discouraging interested students from foreign language study, all believed it was essential to set better standards concerning prediction of success. In half of the districts surveyed, the student's English grade was this so-called indicator of success.[13] Yet, research available on foreign language aptitude provides little information on how to predict a student's success. We are simply wrong too much of the time. Sandstrom, et. al., point out that while language aptitude has been studied for years, the highest correlations that are consistently attainable between predicted and actual achievement are on the order of 0.70. Such commonly-used predictors as IQ, verbal IQ, English grades, English reading level, or teacher opinion are far less sophisticated than a language aptitude test battery and hence are much less valid as a basis for exclusion. IQ, for example, correlates only about 0.40 with actual foreign language achievement. "Actually," the authors contend, "there are certain students who excel only in language. Most known methods of selection tend to exclude these students from foreign language study, thereby depriving them of their only opportunity to do especially well in a school subject."[14]

The fact is that we do not know whom to exclude — we do not really know what makes a successful language learner. Perhaps Naiman's assessment is correct that what basically separates the successful learner from the unsuccessful learner is the former's ability to adapt easily to a given environment and instructional mode.[15] Thus, we may presently be labelling many students poor language learners simply because their learning styles and characteristics do not fit the procrustean bed of the classroom.

Our open doors should be preceded by open minds — a willingness to meet each student as an individual and to explore and develop his potential, for, as Rocher states, "Every child should be free to elect foreign language studies . . . There is no more justification for limiting foreign language study to the verbally talented, than for limiting industrial arts or typing to the mechanically skilled."[16]

The Socially Disadvantaged or Mentally Handicapped Child

It must be stressed from the outset that "disadvantaged" is a hopelessly relative term, and as such does not describe a homogeneous group of children. There are so many effects of being deprived that one cannot say there is a universal effect. Educationally and culturally, the disadvantaged child is one whose personal experiences and learning opportunities have been different and limited, compared to the majority of children of the same age and grade. The socially impoverished child is vulnerable to the same atrophic processes which affect a child's physical growth when he is nutritionally deprived during infancy. Theirs is a decline in the ability to experience, not just to be exposed to enriching stimuli, but to perceive them, encourage them, and respond to them by organizing thoughts, reflecting on situations and mentally manipulating what takes place in and around them.

Rarely is a distinction made between the socially disadvantaged and the mildly mentally retarded child, though the latter may be due to genetic factors or organic

causes instead of a deprived cultural/familial environment: ". . . the distinction between the two categories is of limited importance for educational planning because the behavioral characteristics associated with each are not necessarily different."[17] These are the children who are consistently unable to do assignments. They may sit, completely bewildered by the activity, or may attempt it and give up in disgust. Hart notes that for the teacher who is concerned about the amount of time it takes to teach a particular concept and who is anxious to have all children complete the same amount during the year, these children are particularly frustrating.[18] In a sense, the socially deprived children may be considered multiply handicapped in that they will, in all probability, demonstrate below average performance (not potential) in thinking, language development, and overall academic achievement.

The socially disadvantaged child typically possesses a concrete style of conceptualization. While mental ability will vary, these students tend to be "object-minded" and lack interest in the theoretical and abstract. They will generally have difficulty in classifying, categorizing, generalizing, grasping cause-effect and part-whole relationships, seeing similarities and differences, and dealing with words and concepts that have no concrete referents. They will need to see or touch in order to understand. White states that the transition to the use of signs and symbols in interpreting things perceived is much less frequent and less automatic in the disadvantaged child than in children from homes where there is more stimulation from oral language, pictures, printed materials, tools, music, and toys.[19] He stresses, however, that this does not mean that deprived children cannot think; it means only that they think in a different mode. As Eisner has expressed it, "children who do not learn to see will not be able to write, not because they cannot spell, but because they have nothing to say."[20]

Students who are weak in abstract thought will learn most successfully by an inductive approach through which their experiences are guided to move from part to whole. In the foreign language classroom, as Brannon and Cox[21] point out, emphasis should be on language usage, not grammar *per se*. The lecture and rule memorization approach would be totally unsuitable for this type of learner due to their limited ability to cope with the theoretical. Drills should be used whenever possible. The majority of these students will need more repetition, more examples before getting to the point, will profit from a variety of concrete applications of a specific concept, and will require carefully sequenced, repeated exposure in a structured environment. They should be allowed to work at a level they can handle, receiving brief but frequent reinforcement of new skills daily.

Ausubel[22] proposes that slow transition to abstract thought may be at least partially attributable to a delay in learning certain language forms. Since a person's language is a reflection of social circumstances, children whose language use is inhibited by incorrect, infrequent or simplistic modelling will likely exhibit a rate of development below their peers. Indeed, as Blank and Solomon point out,[23] perhaps the most glaring deficiency of socially disadvantaged children is that they do not possess a symbolic system by which to organize the plentiful situation which surrounds them. Metfessel[24] cites as the most difficult obstacle the understanding of the symbolic nature of language: the disadvantaged child does not typically perceive the concept that objects have names, that the same object may have different names, and that the name of a thing is not the thing itself. The foreign language teacher may have a vital role to play

in this regard. A seventh-grade "communications class" in Brattleboro, Vermont,[25] exposes students to many forms of human communication through language, art, music, dance, body language, and singing, in an attempt to "demystify" language study. Courses such as those developed by Warriner,[26] Barton,[27] and Galloway,[28] are directed toward helping students understand, through "hands-on" activities, basic concepts about language and the communicative process — that language is a reflection of culture; that it provides group identity; that it is not always spoken, not always written; that it is symbolic, infinite, arbitrary and changeable; and that one's language may not "make sense" to others. In a 1980 Northeast Conference survey, 23% of secondary educators responding indicated that they were offering some sort of introductory course at the junior high school level whose aim was to educate children about the nature of language in general, though only 1.7% indicated such a course was taught at the senior high level.[29]

Reissman claims that though disadvantaged children display weak language skills when confronted with forced compliance with standardized middle class usage; they are quite expressive when using their own idiom and conversing with peers. In fact, he states, these children have a "colorful, free, associative feeling for metaphor in language."[30] Just how much this deviation from standard language usage is accepted or tolerated in the classroom, however, is debatable. Poor language development or use of non-standard forms of English in the classroom may be an emotional crippler for this child. From a review of research on teacher attitudes toward non-standard English, Ford[31] concluded that there was a noticeable degree of ethnocentrism on the part of teachers when student language usage deviated from standard middle class norms. On the basis of frequently-stated humanistic benefits supposedly deriving from foreign language study, Ford proposed to find out in his study whether prospective foreign language teachers would profess significantly more positive attitudes toward English dialect differences than prospective teachers from other areas of the curriculum. While the results showed a more positive attitude on the part of all teachers than is generally recognized, of the four groups polled, foreign language teachers were *not* as accepting of non-standard dialects as either prospective English or math teachers, though their attitudes were slightly more positive than those of prospective social studies teachers. One is reminded of the frequently-heard cry: "Teach them a foreign language? These kids don't even know English!"

Weak language development and delayed abstraction may cause these students to be classified by the unknowing teacher as "not very bright;" yet, intelligence is, in part, a function of opportunity. Aside from one's degree of native endowment, there are numerous other factors which militate against high achievement — factors over which teachers and society in general exert some control, such as: the student's lack of will power, arising from unclear standards and either too low or impossible demands; the student's lack of motivation, arising from perceived irrelevance and lack of interest; and the student's low expectation. The latter should be of particular concern. While the ambition of disadvantaged children tends to be bounded by the world they know, their expectations of themselves are formed not just through habit and outlook on life, but by the people around them. A history of failure may promote expectations of failure which, in turn, make actual failure more likely. As Brannon and Cox point out, "the disadvantaged child may be as intelligent as any other provided we define

intelligence as potential for learning"[32] and, it may be added, as long as opportunities are provided to develop this potential.

Perhaps the greatest problem these children face is that of a poor self image, and their deliberate exclusion from foreign language study may contribute to the perpetuation of this problem. Sandstrom, et al, claim that the association of foreign language study with an intellectual elite has made this area of learning a status symbol. Many students who have been denied the opportunity to participate in foreign language learning yearn at least to carry a foreign language textbook in an effort to seek a different identification. Other students ridicule the language learning experience in an effort to devalue something of which they are not a part. Furthermore, the authors note, attitudinal inventories indicate that students heretofore excluded from foreign language programs develop a more positive self-image when involved in foreign language learning.[33]

A review of some of the research available on socially disadvantaged children leads to the following summary of possible learner characteristics.[34] While it should be noted that not all socially deprived children will bear these traits, it may be assumed that the child possessing even one of these to a great extent will suffer diminished self esteem.

THE SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENT MAY BE UNABLE TO VIEW ADULTS AS RESOURCES

Many students come from family environments in which questions are as infrequently asked as they are answered; consequently, these children do not perceive adults in general as people of whom one asks questions and receives answers. Added to this is the fact that these learners may view their own questions as "dumb," their answers as "wrong," and the teacher's answers as too theoretical. In Papalia's study of learning styles and learner characteristics of urban and suburban language students, he notes that urban children, while tending to be more dependent on the teacher for support, encouragement and prodding, also tended to blame the teacher instead of themselves when things did not go well.[35] It may thus be advisable for the teacher frequently to step out of the role of "provider" of information and allow small group work and peer teaching, correction, and discussion. Uhl[36] recommends the smallest group session economically possible for these students. As Brannon and Cox point out, "verbalization and communication may be especially important to them, because some may not have been allowed to verbalize their own language at home."[37]

THE DISADVANTAGED LEARNER IS TYPICALLY IMPULSIVE AND HIGHLY DISTRACTIBLE

These students appear to be more problem-centered that other students and may easily feel frustrated and impotent when confronted with a multitude of information. Yet, Reissman[38] notes their exceptional ability for task perseverance when engrossed in a single activity. Naiman[39] suggests that classroom activities eliminate as many irrelevant and distracting cues as possible since field dependent learners have difficulty selecting appropriate cues for attention. Birckbichler and Omaggio[40] offer a variety of activities to assist students in becoming more field independent, such as clue searching, cloze adaptation, contextual guessing, resume writing and synthesis tasks

involving embedding, reordering scrambled sentences, and expanding dehydrated clauses.

These learner characteristics also suggest the need for instructional variety during the class period. Independent work should be avoided as much as possible since these students frequently need guidance to direct their attention and develop interest. The learner should be confronted with one task at a time, broken down into its component parts and should not be allowed to leave a task unfinished. This does not mean that the level of acceptable performance should necessarily be compromised, rather that the amount of work to be done be reduced or incrementally sequenced. Metfessel[41] also advises that teachers give clear, simple, multi-stage directions, but refrain from sequencing directions such as "first you do this . . . , then this . . . , then this . . . " since the learner will likely respond only to the last command heard.

While there is some evidence that a certain degree of impulsiveness and spontaneity is advantageous to second language learning,[42] such consistent behavior will almost surely jeopardize one's chances of achieving accuracy. Impulsive learners can profit when the teacher helps them to focus on this behavior, to reflect on the adequacy of their responses, and to talk themselves through problem-solving situations. Meredith[43] reports on success by forcing delayed response with foreign language learners, citing the views that impulsive responders frequently underuse their capabilities. In one study, an "imposed latency" treatment group was forced, by means of activated recorders, to wait twenty-five seconds before recording answers. It was found that *both* reflective and impulsive subjects performed at a higher level of proficiency when a latency period was imposed on them than when allowed to respond as soon as they wished.

THE DISADVANTAGED STUDENT GENERALLY IS NOT HIGHLY MOTIVATED TO SUCCEED

For children who are products of a community and upbringing with minimal formal education, a low level of aspiration is often the result. Bounded by limited personal experience, the socially disadvantaged child typically lacks the ability to plan ahead and foresee outcomes and will experience difficulty applying and transferring learning from one situation to another. Reissman[44] points out that the disadvantaged student is especially alienated by schools and classes where the middle class norm of what appears to be knowledge for its own sake prevails. The tendency to treat every situation as unique and unrelated to previous situations implies that these students, especially, will need to be guided toward transfer by means of programs and activities deliberately planned to stress and reinforce interdisciplinary skill and knowledge relationships. Anisfeld notes that in language learning itself, knowledge transfer must be taught, since, for most students, every new response appears to be bound principally to the stimulus context in which it was acquired.[45]

The unmotivated learner will require frequent and immediate feedback and positive reinforcement. Uhl[46] reports on successful strategies for maximizing student motivation and proficiency of skills with disadvantaged children in mathematics classes: (1) students charted and evaluated their own progress, (2) teachers monitored student progress daily, and (3) positive reinforcers were given in the forms of social reinforcement, free time reinforcement, and token reinforcement through letter grades. Initially, he states, token reinforcement was accomplished by testing at a lower

rate than that at which the student was functioning so that each student would experience success at the start. From this starting point, each student progressed to his or her own academic functioning level and letter grades reflected individual progress rather than grade level expectations appropriate for their chronological age. McClary[47] describes a motivational method which, by awarding students points for assignment completion, accuracy of work, and time spent in practice, rewards effort while placing the responsibility for success or failure on the students themselves.

These students will need to see the relevance of what they are learning, to understand how it relates to their daily experiences — academic and non-academic — and to feel the need to expand their vistas; yet, trying to widen the world of knowledge to include things "foreign" and far away presents an awesome task. The foreign language teacher should use real life experiences and meaningful examples, and, building on the immediate environment, gradually expand into the larger environment of the child. Class activities can be personalized; programs can be made more relevant through a broader cultural base which considers, when possible, the student's own cultural heritage and background. Spanish materials, for example, should reflect not only a peninsular orientation, but also depict Hispanics living in the United States, Mexico, and Puerto Rico. French materials should not focus solely on the middle class Frenchman, but acquaint students somewhat with the lifestyles of people in numerous other French-speaking countries. The teacher's task becomes one of reinforcing the familiar to make the student feel more at home and sparking interest in the non-familiar so the student will wish to travel beyond his home.

Additionally, the foreign language teacher who attempts to sell this student the benefits of foreign language study would do best to avoid such cliches as "it will broaden your horizons," or "someday you may meet a Frenchman." Cincinnato states:

> For many years, we, as second language teachers, have employed rationales for language study that unfortunately have not generated a great deal of interest and motivation toward the learning of this very practical skill. Explanations of existing abstract conditions or reasons such as a shrinking jet-age world, the understanding of one's own culture through the appreciation of other cultures, the satisfaction of reading periodicals and literary works in the target language, the possibility of future travel abroad, etc., all are good and valid for people who have a clear appreciation and understanding of the long-term benefits derived from language study, and from a well-rounded education. But what of the great majority of today's students?[48]

Not only will a new rationale be needed for these students, but also a reanalysis of present goals, curricular designs and instructional techniques. Relevance to today's student will not be gained by compartmentalized "islands of experience."

Izzo[49] states that unlike IQ and language aptitude, which remain relatively stable throughout life, attitude and accompanying motivation are learned behavior and can be changed. One of the few articles available on teaching foreign language to students of low-level intelligence, "French for the Feeble-Minded,"[50] tends to support this contention. This article, published in 1942 and written in the language of its day, reports on experiences in teaching French to ten mentally deficient girls, nine of whom were classified as "imbeciles" (average IQ about 40), and one as a "moron" (IQ about 75). Initially high interest and motivation levels were maintained throughout the course of instruction by oral teaching methods which were based on the following:

(1) The "children" themselves inquired after what they wanted to know.
(2) Drills and repetition were varied and playful and often accompanied by exaggerated expression and gesture.
(3) Never a word was said about grammatical gender, number, or person; students eventually knew what "sounded" correct and what "sounded" wrong.
(4) Phrases and objects requested to be learned in French came from the immediate environment.
(5) "Calisthenics" and motor response were considered primary.
(6) An atmosphere of fun and "make believe" was established.

Angiolillo explains: "The girls could not be made to take an interest in an exercise which emphasized the French expression to be learned and nothing else . . . the lesson had to contain some element of fun, not fun in which learning French was incidental, but fun in which all the amusement came from using French instead of English in an old or new situation."[31] This atmosphere of "make believe" was, as the author contends, vital to the successful performance of these students whose limited capability seemed to be compensated for by a great amount of enthusiasm and ambition to speak like "French girls."

In response to the question, "were they really learning French?" Angiolillo's answer is "yes." He notes that the girls' limited native language ability was repetitious and inflexible, making it difficult to ascertain how much cognition accompanied their English speech. It could therefore not be expected that their use of simple French French would be different. Yet, that the words did have a definite meaning to these girls separate from a given context or special position in a series of questions and answers, was demonstrated by the children's appropriate use of individual French words in English sentences, the French equivalents for which they had not yet learned.

At the end of six weeks, these children had mastered an active vocabulary of about eighty words and expressions so well that when tested one year later, they had retained as a group 100% of the material and individually on an average of over 90%. "It is indeed unfortunate," the author notes, "that circumstances in the average classroom make it impossible to employ this practical procedure of modern language instruction more extensively."[32]

THE DISADVANTAGED STUDENT TYPICALLY POSSESSES A COGNITIVE STYLE WHICH RESPONDS TO VISUAL/KINESTHETIC SYMBOLS

These children will usually have difficulty dealing with a variety of stimuli and will not progress as rapidly through oral/aural modes unaccompanied by visual or physical activity. They may thus have difficulty with oral directions, expository teaching techniques, word and sound discrimination, and participation in rapid drills.

An interesting area of research would be the applicability of one of the more kinesthetic/concrete-oriented methodologies such as the Total Physical Response method.[33] TPR, for example, is based on the premises (1) that perceptual readiness reduces stress, (2) that children acquire their native language through physical activity, and (3) that in native language learning, listening fluency is achieved before speaking is attempted. With this method, meaningfulness is enhanced by student involvement in carrying out physical commands as instructed by the teacher. The

imperative form thus serves as the nesting device through which other linguistic features of the language are assimilated. The target language is the predominant means of communication and is accompanied by actions or pictures. Referring to a field test of this method with adult learners, Joiner speculates: "The repeated hearing and acting out of the commands may have compensated in some way for the general slowing down of auditory processing characteristics of adults, and the fact that students were not pressured to speak from the beginning of instruction could certainly be a factor in promoting self-confidence."[54] Such techniques would seem to have definite advantages over traditional methods for these children in that (1) they are action-oriented, (2) they focus on auditory development, (3) they utilize concrete examples, and (4) they seem to have a stress reduction effect. Additionally, Stevick observes,[55] the kinesthetic response may have a powerful effect on long-term memory.

Preferred perceptual modes and learning styles will, however, depend on the individual student. The descriptions given in this section have been intended only to help the teacher become attuned to some possible differences between these and other learners. Saville-Troike[56] notes that social and cultural factors may help determine the most appropriate method for a given group of students. Referring to a project for teaching English to Spanish-speaking children of farm laborers in California, she concludes that preferred classroom behavior may, in certain instances, differ between boys and girls. According to the cultural patterns of this particular group, boys were allowed considerable freedom at home and in the classroom were more extroverted and eager to try new activites without worrying about making mistakes. Girls were kept in the house and given responsibility for caring for younger siblings; in class they were shy and reluctant to attempt anything new. Teaching methods in which games and physical activity were used extensively worked well for boys who learned more English than the girls. The author concluded that the girls might have done better if the cultural factors influencing classroom behavior had been taken into account and if instruction had been modified accordingly.

Poor classroom performance may also be the result of weak or ineffective study habits. These students may need help in planning and goal setting and should be provided time within the class day for work assignments, since home situations may not be conducive to the completion of out-of-class tasks. Reiss[57] finds a very distinct difference in study habits between successful and unsuccessful students. When students were asked to describe how they prepared for various assignments, the high achievers responded with specific and detailed task-attack strategies, while the low achieving student tended to respond with vague language such as "memorize" and "study." She advises that teachers encourage the more proficient students to practice "think aloud" techniques for the class and ask successful students to serve as informants regarding their own strategies, techniques, and study skills. Slower students should also be encouraged to experiment until they find their own particular learning style.

The Learning Disabled Child

The term "learning disabled" (LD) is shorthand for a wide range of learning

problems. LD children are known by a variety of terms — conceptually/perceptually handicapped, dyslexic, dysgraphic, language disordered, minimal brain dysfunction — and comprise, by broadness of category, the largest group of handicapped children nationwide. Some experts estimate that as many as 10-30% of all U.S. children have some form of learning disability.[58] LD children are those who, from nutritional deficits, brain damage, hereditary factors, poor teaching, or numerous other causes, are not achieving at their expected potential, although they are *within the normal intelligence range*. Many of these children are still written off as mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, or culturally deprived; yet, by definition, the LD child is one who may exhibit one or more of a vast array of perceptual disorders which are *not* caused by emotional disturbance, mental retardation, physical disability, or poor environmental conditions. They are characterized by scattered performance — their uneven development producing strong abilities and high performance in some areas, failure and poor performance in others. Since some areas of functioning are within normal limits, the educational treatment for these students would be quite different from that indicated for students whose profiles show poor achievement overall.

It is difficult to generalize in terms of a representative LD child who possesses no one specific deficit or pattern of characteristics. What may safely be said of all learning disabled children, however, is that they are sometime-underachievers and will display deficits, gaps, and odd patterns in specific areas of learning. They also typically suffer from low self esteem and have seldom developed the necessary coping strategies for their differences. Learning disabled children range from the severely handicapped, needing special classes, to the mild underachievers who get C's and D's when they have the capacity to get A's.

Smith[59] states that it is the uneven quality of this child that is so bewildering: He is a veritable "patchwork quilt of 'can dos' and 'can't dos'," one day performing a task effortlessly, the next appearing totally impotent. These are often the students described in the teachers' lounge as draining, demanding, devouring, defeating, or uncontrollable, unreachable, unteachable. Primarily because of their erratic, unpredictable, and frequently defensive behavior they will unintentionally consume their teachers, exhaust them, and bring out all the teacher's fears of inadequacy and incompetence.

Sadly, these children are often simply viewed as lazy, spoiled, clumsy, or immature. Yet, Smith gives some hint of the utter disorientation this child may experience:

> Try threading a needle with a pair of extra thick rubber gloves on . . . imagine trying to tie a bow when you cannot visualize what a loop looks like. It is the feeling of a lost driver who knows his destination but doesn't know where he's starting from, of a frantic mother who is being yelled at but can't locate her keys anywhere.[60]

The most common perceptual disorder experienced by learning disabled children is that associated with word recognition and use. Reading problems result from confusion of letters and their order. In the learner's eyes, the letters on a page may run together, be reversed or upside down, or they may be grouped into completely different words that the child is unable to decipher. Mirror imaging may cause such letters as *b* and *d* and *m* and *w* to appear indistinguishable. In the following example, Hart provides insight into what this child may see when he looks at the printed page:

> Cnilpreh mitn barticular broplews way rivir slillirs aup way hot de aple to make ort mnat they say. Theywa ysee ellillirs fo rotners, tne yway pron dtneeliloirs so tna t sne ybo hot for wmorbs that wake sehseto tne m.[61]

In reporting on the experience of teaching Latin to a dyslexic college student, Ancona found this mirror imaging to be especially troublesome: "Memorized declensions were sometimes 'flipped upside down,' causing him to mistakenly retrieve an ablative form instead of the nominative from the top of the chart."[62]

Writing and spelling skills may also be weakened by reversals, omissions, transposition and phonetic spelling. Single letters or entire syllables may be left out both in writing and speaking and entire words may be omitted from sentences. Perceptual problems will frequently cause difficulties in relating the spoken work to the written word. The learner may have certain auditory discrimination problems that prevent him from hearing fine differences in words such as *glass* and *class* or *someday* and *Sunday*. Students with severe writing problems may avoid the demands of this skill entirely; auditory distortion problems may cause the student to "tune out" since much of what he hears seems to be nonsense.

Ancona[63] describes techniques used to compensate for the dyslexic's weak language abilities: all skills — listening, speaking, reading, and writing — were brought into play to provide as many channels for learning as possible. Pre-recorded textbook lessons provided an alternative learning route to the student and lessened his dependence on textbook reading. In testing situations, questions and directions were read aloud by the teacher and the student was permitted to respond with either an oral *or* a written answer. The author notes that assessing the performance or knowledge of the dyslexic student is particularly frustrating in that it requires distinguishing errors that result from dyslexia from those which reflect inadequate mastery of material. When such doubt arises, errors should perhaps be pointed out *during* testing so that the student may be given the opportunity to correct them. While the college environment allowed for a one-to-one teacher-student ratio in this case, the secondary classroom could make effective use of peer teaching techniques with students either serving as tutors for the language disabled or releasing the teacher for more intensive individual work with these students as required.

Ancona concludes from this experience that the study of Latin, at least, may actually be beneficial to some dyslexic students because of its phonetic spelling and inflected structure:

> The fact that Latin is a phonetic language makes spelling correctly easier. It also helps the dyslexic to connect the spoken word with the written word . . . Studying an inflected language requires breaking words down into smaller units . . . This is useful for the dyslexic who has probably experienced difficulty in discriminating morphemes in the native language. Similarly, the dyslexic, who may transpose words in an English sentence, may find relief in the inflected language where word order is less important to meaning.

A review of some of the research available on learning disabled children[64] reveals several frequently-noted characteristics. While it should be stressed that each LD child is unique with a different set of learning difficulties in different areas of study, the following may alert teachers to specific learning problems which will require special assistance and attention.

OVERLOADING

The learning disabled child is typically characterized by immature behavior. His actions and reactions are not abnormal, just delayed, and may be entirely appropriate for an earlier phase of growth. Though many students will demonstrate immature behavior periodically and in specific situations, it is the quality, intensity, and long duration of such behavior which makes the LD child different.

This immaturity gives LD children a very precarious sense of order. They may lack the ability to discriminate, to sort out the relevant from the irrelevant in their environments, and to categorize the mass of sights, sounds, and feelings which enter their minds unscreened. While their distractibility is often interpreted by teachers as a failure to pay attention, Smith notes it is more accurately *overattention* to too many things:[65] bombarded with multiple sensations all of which have equal importance to them, they get caught up in the details and miss the big picture. This sensory overloading is generally the most frequent complaint of learning disabled adults who express the extreme fatigue which results from trying to block out extra stimulation and focus on the task at hand.

Thus, LD students in the classroom will have difficulty coping with any unstructured learning environment. Open classrooms can be painfully frustrating; priorities and options will be baffling; total immersion is unbearable. Space and time, as abstract concepts, will typically mean nothing to them — they may lack the ability to plan and use time effectively, yet feel an urgent need to organize their work in order to learn it.

Such students will require limiting and structure, not flexibility, to focus on the task. They will need to know the purpose of the activity and precisely what is expected of them, told what to look for, what to attend to, what to ignore, and how and where to begin. For these children, limiting such things as the amount of materials, the number of words used, the quantity of procedures and the work itself, does not restrict creativity; rather, it provides the opportunity to learn and create. Clustering and categorizing activities, such as those suggested by Birckbichler and Omaggio[66] may help the student develop the linguistic organizational skills necessary for foreign language learning.

Since these students may be easily distractible, due to overattention to irrelevant stimuli, the teacher should be prepared to change the pace of instruction frequently, planning several different activities for a given class period, alternating energetic with restful exercises. These students will require short-term assignments and, whenever possible, should be provided a quiet, secluded area in which to work.

SEQUENCING PROBLEMS

The learning disabled student's lack of order will commonly be reflected in sequencing problems. Complete sentence responses may be extremely difficult as may recounting events in order of their occurrence. These students will typically relate a happening *in medias res* and may be unable to sort out major events from irrelevant detail. They may omit entire words from sentences in both oral and written language production. Their minds may leap through many ideas before the words can come out, or the words may come tumbling out with no apparent prior consideration. The learning disabled may also tend to persevere, much as a small child does, doing or saying the same thing again and again, interrupting and repeating. In speech, they

may begin a sentence, be unable to continue, and start over incessantly. The necessary sequencing skills may be developed by outlining or segmenting activities, or by providing prompting through visual or other cues so that the student will know where to begin, where to end, and what to recount in between.

FEAR OF FAILURE

Often, the rigidness that accompanies immaturity will be reflected through perfectionist behavior. One mistake may take on catastrophic importance and cause the student to abandon the entire project. For this child, routine and the known are comfortable and make sense; the unknown and unfamiliar may be terrifying for they represent potential failure. Such fear may cause this learner to freeze when required to perform on demand, although when allowed to volunteer, there may be no problem. The rapid-fire drills of the audiolingual classroom could be devastating to a child who becomes terror-stricken and frustrated by "surprise attacks." The classroom teacher will thus need to establish regular routines, familiar procedures, and give advance notice of any anticipated changes.

Afraid of their own mistakes which they equate with failure, the learning disabled may also find mistakes of others disruptive to their fragile sense of balance and order. They may exaggerate the mistakes of classmates and especially resent those of the teacher. It is, therefore, crucial for teachers to give themselves permission, frankly and out loud, to make mistakes so that students will have permission to do likewise.

Further implications for the foreign language classroom suggest themselves in the area of error correction. The procedures suggested by Joiner[67] would appear especially suitable for these children: allowing silence for students to compose their thoughts before responding; refraining from interruption for correction; rewarding factual accuracy; and clarifying student messages by reflecting back on them through such techniques as rephrasing, prompting, reduction, modeling, forced selection, or illustration. Students should be allowed to stop when they are having difficulty in order to assess the obstacle.

Defensive and easily defeated, this child will need visible, convincing proof of progress. Feelings of defeat may often cause the student to strike back and blame the teacher who may in turn become defensive and angry. Smith[68] points out that a teacher's own feelings about a student are often important diagnostic tools in that usually a teacher's feelings about the student mirror the student's own feelings.

POOR MEMORY

The LD's inability to organize thoughts and screen out extraneous stimuli, as well as their concrete, literal orientation, may pose certain problems with memory and word retrieval. These children will need to see the material they are taught, to have enough experience with it to know it well. For a word to have meaning, it must be associated with an object, a picture, an action, or an experience. Often these students will simply draw a blank and be unable to find the word they need to express themselves. When this happens, the teacher will avoid frustration by simply supplying the word immediately, or by jogging the student's memory with concrete cues.

In observing the dyslexic student, Ancona[69] noted that whereas the student imitated fairly well the pronunciation of words he had just heard, he did not remember the pronunciation for long. All experts agree that frequent repetition is the key in

long-term memory for these children. Yet, repetition should not be limited to choral or individual parroting, but rather, to meeting the same material in a variety of different ways until it has become a part of the child's being. There is at least some evidence also that the practice of requiring a student to repeat immediately after hearing the correct model may not be the most effective course for achieving long-term memory storage. Stevick[70] cites experiments in which some subjects were required to pronounce aloud words in a list while other subjects only read the items silently or heard them spoken by the experimenter. The studies concluded that active vocalization at presentation does seem to interfere with effective coding operations.

Learning disabled youth will also commonly fail to make use of the various ways of organizing memory and may be able to profit by overt strategies and memory devices developed and used by successful learners. Birckbichler and Omaggio[71] offer several types of classroom activites designed to help students develop the necessary memory skills: categorizing, clustering, resume writing, chain sentences or stories, and those activities which require the learner to respond to a narrative by separating components heard from those not heard in the oral text. Weaknesses in long-term retention would also suggest the benefits of distributed practice in class as this would tend to allow the mind to store a greater variety of cues instead of multiple copies of the same image.

While the learning disabled may experience one or more of a vast array of learning problems, several authors note that these children also tend to be quite gifted in many ways. Since their attempts to adopt the same learning style and comportment as others are often thwarted, they must use their ingenuity to find different avenues for learning and achieving. Ancona, for example, notes the high level of motivation, industriousness, and drive to achieve.[72] Smith[73] cites the LD's enthusiasm, spontaneity, unusual creativity, and fresh, unique perspective. She contends that the very disabilities which cripple classroom performance may have been at the root of some of our most valued inventions, artistic works, and literary accomplishments.

Learning disabled youth are also quite often very empathic individuals, given the difficulties with which they, themselves, must cope on a daily basis. There are indications that empathy, as one personality variable, may have a positive effect on foreign language learning. Guiora and colleagues,[74] for example, suggest that empathy as they have measured it may at least be related to pronunciation accuracy in foreign language learning. The LD's empathic ability may, in fact, lead to the responsive condition which Gardner and Lambert feel is requisite to the good language learner: " . . . the willingness to identify enough to adopt distinctive aspects of behavior, linguistic and non-linguistic, that characterize that other group."[75]

Summary and Conclusion

This Report has summarized possible characteristics of learning disabled and socially deprived/educationally handicapped children in an effort to determine the extent to which particular handicapping conditions would pose achievement problems in the foreign language classroom. While some of the learner characteristics

discussed run contrary to those cognitive styles and personality variables most commonly associated with the successful foreign language learner, such as field independence, categorization ability, and tolerance of ambiguity, there is at least indication that some of these learners bring with them certain characteristics which might be advantageous to the language learning experience, such as task perserverance, spontaneity, and empathy.[76] In recognition of the fact that learner classification systems are unreliable and that generalizations drawn on groups of individuals are misleading, general classroom strategies have been offered in response to specific learner characteristics sometimes associated with the learning disabled and socially deprived/educationally handicapped students. The learner needs discussed herein would seem to have definite implications not only for instructional strategies, but also for program development and for the role of the classroom teacher.

The word "slow," often used to refer to the handicapped student, should not be considered a disparaging descriptor, nor should the student who works or comprehends at a slower pace than the rest of the students continually be confronted with failure. The learners addressed in this Report have special types of learning problems with which they must cope. They simply will require *more time* to complete a task, to process information, to organize thoughts, to respond to questions, and to master increments of learning, and they will need more opportunity for association and meaningful rehearsal. For these students, pressure disorganizes rather than helps. Smith notes, "only in a culture obsessed with speed of education and measurable results would those who fail to meet these norms be considered disabled people."[77]

A review of the literature illustrates how foreign language teachers are exploring programmatic options to accomodate better the needs of the slower learner. Wattenmaker describes a plan to free students from failure by awarding credits after a high degree of understanding and skill is achieved. No record is kept of the length of time taken to reach that standard, nor is any student penalized if he decides he cannot or does not want to keep trying it.[78] In DeKalb County, Georgia, two courses, Functional Spanish I and II offer, in two years, the majority of material covered in the first year of beginning Spanish.[79] In the same state, the Parkway School District 7-12 foreign language program has established a policy that permits students to repeat any language level without penalty up to grade ten. In Lyons Township, students have the option, contingent upon respective ability groupings, of completing Levels 1-2 of language study in 1½, two or three years. At Nicolet, a special sequence, Conversational Spanish 1-2 stresses basic conversational skills — the pace is slow with frequent review. A second level of this program stresses practical aspects of the language while allowing students to progress at their own rate.[80]

The Oxon Hill (Md.) Senior High School foreign language program demonstrates the success that can be achieved with multi-level grouping for foreign language instruction. It also demonstrates how a commitment to programming for all students can create a new mood "where solutions instead of problems are the focus of attention." Here, at each level of language (except Level 1), two major proficiency divisions were established — an on-level group and a sub-level group. Students who were more proficient (grades of A or B) were put into the on-level group. Students who needed more practice time before beginning the next level (less than B) were placed in the sub-level group. Parallel scheduling and teacher guidance and consultation accomo-

dated acceleration or decline in proficiency by allowing students to move from sub-level to on-level during the year. The principal, Michael Hernick, reports on the success of this program: " . . . our most rewarding experience has been with the sub-level groups. Students who were having a hard time the previous year seemed to come to life because so many C and D students became A and B students with a little more practice. All they needed was a bit more time. A few of these students take as much as three years to cover a little more than two levels of language, but they *do continue* in the program because they are finding success at their speed."[81]

While forced ability tracking may only serve to further stigmatize this student, such groupings may afford successful experiences when students are allowed to aid in the selection of the level most appropriate for them. Certainly, in the foreign language classroom in which testing practices and classroom activites reflect speed and spelling priorities through written fill-in-the-blanks grammar items and an obsession with covering the book, this student's anticipated failure is likely to become a reality. Accomodating these students may mean simplifying considerably the grammatical repertoire in favor of a broader vocabulary range. Wherritt offers suggestions for streamlining classroom materials through the rearranging and deletion of grammatical items in order to afford the presentation of a more useful and native-like language. She concludes that under conditions of natural language use, a large exposure to vocabulary may take a student further than a heavy dose of grammar.[82]

Accepting the challenge of the slower learner in the foreign language classroom will demand of the teacher a great deal of flexibility — the willingness to observe and adapt accordingly. Hosenfeld[83] contends that what is needed is a reconceptualization of the instructional process which would represent a shift in focus from "learning adapted to teaching" to "teaching adapted to learning." Students would provide the initial input in the form of learner strategies and teaching would be tailored to this input. Thus, the good teacher will be a good detective — finding out what works and what does not work, investigating and sharing strategies of successful foreign language learners, and discovering and experimenting with techniques which "work" for slower students in other curricular areas. Teachers may find such instruments as Papalia's Learning Modality Inventory[84] useful in assessing students' classroom behaviors in terms of cognitive style, sensory mode, work habits, personal characteristics, and so on.

Effective adaptation will presuppose a thorough knowledge of the subject matter. Yet, knowing the language well enough to be able to break it down into its component parts and teach it step by step or approach it in a variety of different ways will not guarantee success with the exceptional student. Needed also is an interest in and willingness to learn about the slower student and his specific learning problems. Barriett, for example, extolls the benefits of dual certification for foreign language teachers in such areas as reading:

> Now I understand why some students had difficulty copying the Spanish correctly; why so many students reversed their letters and had particular difficulty with radical verbs; why so many had difficulty attending to word endings; why so many students had difficulty getting the inferences in reading selections when they seemed to know the vocabulary involved; why so many students seemed to be stronger in one modality than in another. I realized just how very much is involved

in reading and writing and that difficulties involved were most often not because of a failure in the foreign language.[85]

Beatrice Leffert, reading specialist, when asked, "How much does a foreign language teacher need to know about reading?" replies, "At least as much — if not more — than an English teacher."[86]

It may be precisely this interest and willingness to adapt — in short, the teacher's attitude — which will determine the success of the non-traditional language learner. Attitude is perhaps the most powerful tool a teacher possesses, for the teacher's attitudes toward the language, toward individual students, and toward learning in general, can affect — either positively or negatively — students' perceptions of learning. McClary[87] believes that teacher and student attitudes are the most important, the most difficult to understand, and the most overlooked aspect of the learning process and that, though teachers indirectly model and promote certain attitudes every time they come in contact with students, they are too often unaware of the consequences that their own attitudes and values have upon the learner. Sandstrom, et al, feel that teachers have a *responsibility* to be interesting to students and to display a strong commitment to and personal fascination for what they are teaching.[88]

Above all else, language teachers must be willing to "learn to do by doing" with respect to teaching the "other" student. Just as we teach our students to approach new and different cultures with an air of acceptance and anticipation, so must we welcome the "other" student to our classrooms in the spirit of experimentation which characterizes the present mood of the profession. Recognizing that data on successful foreign language learner characteristics are at this point inconclusive, it would seem that learner labels and eternal ranking systems devised and designated by the educational system in general may indicate nothing of the learner's potential in the foreign language classrrom. It is unlikely that future research will prove otherwise, for to direct our energies to demonstrating that certain individuals cannot learn a foreign langauge would be unproductive. Instead, as our understanding of these students becomes more sophisticated we will find more effective ways of reaching them. The invisibly handicapped learner as a foreign language research area is relatively untouched. We have much to learn. These students have much to teach us.

Notes

1. Harvard Committee, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1955) p. 12.

2. Margaret L. Clark and Marjorie H. Rudolph, "Why or Why Not Foreign Languages?" *Foreign Language Annals*, 14(1981) pp. 317-324.

3. Elaine Potoker, "Preliminary Investigation of Factors Influencing the Revitalization of High School Foreign Language Programs," *Foreign Language Annals*, 13(1980) p. 30.

4. John D. Tudor and Alvena Smarr, "School Effectiveness: A Report to the South Carolina State Board of Education Subcommittee for the Study of Accreditation." 1982.

5. Eleanor L. Sandstrom, Paul Pimsleur, and the Northeast Conference Working Committee III, "Foreign Languages for All Students?" in *Foreign Language and the New Student*. Joseph A. Tursi, ed. 1970 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1970), p. 133.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 108.

7. Lorraine A. Strasheim, "Pedagogical Corner" *Foreign Language Annals*, 12(Sept., 1979), p. 318.

8. *Harvard Committee*. op. cit., p. 11.

9. Gene Stanford, *Dealing with Differences: Classroom Practices in Teaching English 1980-81* (Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English) EDRS: ED 193, 639, p. 9.

10. U.S. Department of Education, *Fourth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of PL 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act*, p. 6.

11. Federal Register, Vol. 42, #163, August 23, 1977, Federal Regulations which implement PL 94-142, Section 121a.305, p. 42489.

12. Ingeborg R. McCoy, "Means to Overcome the Anxieties of Second Language Learners" *Foreign Language Annals*, 12(May, 1979), pp. 185-89.

13. Potoker, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

14. Sandstrom, et al, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

15. Neil Naiman, Maria Frolich, and Angie Todesco, "The Good Language Learner" *TESL Talk*, 6(1975), pp. 58-70.

16. Rosemarie Rocher in William D. Sims and Sandra B. Hammond, *Award-Winning Foreign Language Programs: Prescriptions for Success* (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1980), p. 48.

17. Richard B. Denver, "A Proposal to Teach English as a Foreign Language to Educable Mentally Retarded Children" *Exceptional Children* 32(1969), p. 367.

18. Verna Hart, *Mainstreaming Children with Special Needs* (New York: Longman, 1981).

19. William White, *Tactics for Teaching the Disadvantaged* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).

20. Elliott W. Eisner, "Mind as Cultural Achievement." Speech delivered at the John Dewey Lecture, the John Dewey Society for the Study of Education and Culture, 1979.

21. R. Marshall Brannon and David E. Cox, "Coping with the Real Problems in the Secondary Schools" in *An Integrative Approach to Foreign Language Teaching: Choosing Among the Options*. ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series, Vol. 8, 1976, ed. Gilbert A. Jarvis (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company), pp. 151-199.

22. D. P. Ausubel, "The Effects of Cultural Deprivation on Learning Patterns" *Audio Visual Instruction*, 10(1965), pp. 10-12.

23. Marion Blank and Frances Solomon, "A Tutorial Language Program to Develop Abstract Thinking in Socially Disadvantaged Preschool Children" in *Readings in Child Development and Personality*, ed. Paul Henry Mussen, John Conger and Jerome Kagan (New York: Harper and Row, 1965).

24. Newton S. Metfessel, "Conclusions From Previous Research Findings Which Were Validated by the Research and Evaluation Conducted by the Staff of Project Potential, University of Southern California" in *Developing and Evaluating Art Curricula Specifically Designed for Disadvantaged Youth*, Ronald H. Silverman and Ralph Hoepfner (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969), p. 76.

25. William D. Sims and Sandra B. Hammond, *Award Winning Foreign Language Programs: Prescriptions for Success* (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co., 1980) pp. 68-71.

26. Marilyn Bartos, et al, "Language and Man: An Exploratory Foreign Language Program for Grade Six" (New York: ACTFL Materials Center, 1972).

27. Helen P. Warriner, et al, "Introduction to Foreign Languages: An Exploratory Course That's Different . . . " (New York: ACTFL Materials Center, 1975).

28. Vicki B. Galloway, *Around the World: Languages and the People Who Speak Them* (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Department of Education, 1980).

29. Peter A. Eddy, "Present Status of Foreign Language Teaching: A Northeast Conference

Survey" in *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.* Thomas A. Geno, ed. Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1980), pp. 13-60.

30. Frank Reissman, *The Culturally Deprived Child* (New York: Harper and Row, 1962).

31. James F. Ford, "The Prospective Foreign Language Teacher and the Culturally and Linguistically Different Learner" *Foreign Language Annals,* 11(Sept., 1978) pp. 381-390.

32. Brannon and Cox, *op. cit.,* p. 187.

33. Sandstrom, *op. cit.*

34. In addition to those previously cited, see the following for summaries of learner characteristics of culturally deprived children: Harold Love *Language Development of Exceptional Children* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, 1976); Bill R. Gearheart and Mel W. Weishahn, *The Handicapped Child in the Regular Classroom* (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1976); Martin Deutsch, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Learning Process," in *Education in Depressed Areas,* ed. Harry A. Passow (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), pp. 163-179.

35. Anthony Papalia, "Assessing Students' Learning Styles and Teaching for Individual Differences" *Hispania* 61(May, 1978), pp. 318-322.

36. Robert A. Uhl, "An Individualized Approach for Low Achieving Labelled and Nonlabelled Junior High Mathematics Students: A Longitudinal Report" in *Teaching Handicapped Students Mathematics,* ed. Ellen M. Brockmann (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1981), pp. 23-29.

37. Brannon and Cox, *op. cit.,* p. 188.

38. Reissman, *op. cit.*

39. Naiman, *op. cit.*

40. Diane W. Birckbichler and Alice C. Omaggio, "Diagnosing and Responding to Individual Learner Needs" *Modern Language Journal* 62(1978), pp. 336-45.

41. Metfessel, *op. cit.*

42. Mats Oskarsson, "The Relationship Between Foreign Language Proficiency and Various Psychological Variables." Paper cited in Mary-Ann Reiss, "Helping the Unsuccessful Language Learner" *Modern Language Journal* 65(Summer, 1981), pp. 121-28.

43. Alan R. Meredith, "Improved Oral Test Scores Through Delayed Response" *Modern Language Journal,* 62(1978), p. 321.

44. Reissman, *op. cit.*

45. M. Anisfeld, "Psycholinguistic Perspectives on Language Learning" in *Trends in Language Teaching,* ed. Albert Valdman (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 113.

46. Uhl, *op. cit.*

47. Paul Patrick McClary, "I Fail, You Fail, Who Fails?" *Foreign Language Annals* 12(May, 1979), pp. 193-196.

48. Paul D. Cincinnato, "Second Language Goals Must Be Broadened" *Time Frame* Vol. 5, 1976 (New York: Nassau County Board of Cooperative Education Services), EDRS: ED 130 532, p. 28.

49. Suzanne Izzo, *Second Language Learning: A Review of Related Studies* (Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, 1981).

50. Paul F. Angiolillo, "French for the Feeble-Minded: An Experiment" *Modern Language Journal,* 26(1942), pp. 266-71.

51. *Ibid.,* p. 268.

52. *Ibid.*

53. James J. Asher, "The Total Physical Response Approach to Second Language Learning" *Modern Language Journal* 53(1969); James J. Asher, "Children's First Language As a Model for Second Language Learning," *Modern Language Journal* 56(1972); and James J. Asher, Jo Anne Kusudo and Rita de la Torre, "Learning a Second Language Through

Commands: The Second Field Test," *Modern Language Journal* 58(1974).

54. Elizabeth G. Joiner, *The Older Foreign Language Learner.* Vol. 34 of Language in Education Series (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981), p. 32.

55. Earl W. Stevick, *Memory, Meaning,* and *Method* (Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1976).

56. Muriel Saville-Troike, "Implications of Research on Adult Second Language Acquisition for Teaching Foreign Language to Children," in *Second Language Acquisition and Foreign Language Teaching,* ed. Rosario C. Gingras (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978).

57. Mary Ann Reiss, "Helping the Unsuccessful Language Learner" *Modern Language Journal* 65(Summer, 1981), pp. 121-28.

58. Sally L. Smith, *No Easy Answers: Teaching the Learning Disabled Child* (Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, 1979).

59. *Ibid.,* p. 3

60. *Ibid.,* p. 4

61. *Hart,* op. cit., p. 8.

62. Ronnie Ancona, "Latin and a Dyslexic Student: An Experience in Teaching," soon to be published in *Classical World.*

63. *Ibid.*

64. In addition to previously-cited works, see: Elaine Bierbauer, *If Your Child Has a Learning Disability* (Danville, IL: Interstate Publishers, 1974); William Cruickshank, William Morse and Jeannie Johns, *Learning Disabilities: The Struggle From Adolescence Toward Adulthood* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1980); Richard M. Graham and Alice S. Beer, *Teaching Music to the Exceptional Child* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1980); Donald H. Johnson and Leah J. Johnson, *Learning Disabilities* (Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1978); Emmett Velten and Carlene Sampson, *Rx For Learning Disability* (Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978); William E. Chaiken and Mary Joyce Harper, *Mainstreaming the Learning Disabled Adolescent* (Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publishers, 1979).

65. Smith, *op. cit.*

66. Birckbichler and Omaggio, *op. cit.*

67. Elizabeth Joiner, "Training Prospective Teachers in the Correction of Student Errors" *The French Review,* 49(1975), pp. 193-197.

68. Smith, *op. cit.*

69. Ancona, *op. cit.*

70. Stevick, *op. cit.*

71. Birckbichler and Omaggio, *op. cit.*

72. Ancona, *op. cit.*

73. Smith, *op. cit.*

74. Alexander Z. Guiora, Harlan L. Lane, and Lewis A. Bosworth, "An Exploration of Some Personality Variables in Authentic Pronunciation of a Second Language" in *Language and Language Behavior,* ed. Eric M. Zale (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1968), pp. 261-266.

75. Robert C. Gardner and Wallace E. Lambert, *Attitudes and Motivation in Second Language Learning* (Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1972), p. 132.

76. For summaries of research on successful learner characteristics, see: Mary Ann Reiss, "Helping the Unsuccessful Language Learner," *Modern Language Journal* 65 (Summer, 1981), 121-28; Carol Hosenfeld, "The New Student Role: Individual Differences and Implications for Instruction" in *Perspective: A New Freedom,* Vol. 7 of the ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education, ed. Gilbert A. Jarvis (Skokie, IL: National Textbook Company, 1975); and Len Speery, ed., *Learning Performance and Individual Differences* (Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman, 1972).

77. Smith, *op. cit.,* p. 30.

78. Beverly Wattenmaker, "An Intensive Approach to High School Foreign Language Learning," *Foreign Language Annals* 12(1979), pp. 65-70.

79. *Course Guides for Secondary Schools: Spanish* (DeKalb County, GA: DeKalb Co. Schools, 1979), mimeo.

80. Summaries of these Georgia programs appear in Sim and Hammond, *op. cit.*

81. Sandstrom, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

82. Irene M. Wherritt, "Efficient Presentation of Grammar," *Foreign Language Annals*, 14(1981), pp. 429-434.

83. Carol Hosenfeld, "A Learning-Teaching View of Second Language Instruction," *Foreign Language Annals*, 12(1979), pp. 51-54.

84. Papalia, *op. cit.*, p. 322.

85. Harriet Barriett, "A Case for Dual Preparation" in *Time Frame*, 5(1976) (New York: Nassau County Board of Cooperative Education Services) EDRS: ED 130 532, p. 41.

86. Beatrice Leffert, "Teaching a Foreign Language: A Reading Specialist's Viewpoint" in *Time Frame*, 5(1976) (New York: Nassau County Board of Cooperative Education Services) EDRS: ED 130 532, p. 42.

87. McClary, *op. cit.*

88. Sandstrom, *op. cit.*

H. H. Stern
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto, Canada

Toward a Multidimensional Foreign Language Curriculum

Introduction

In 1980 the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages held a conference on the national priorities in foreign language teaching for the 1980s as they were perceived by the profession. At this meeting a few major topics — curriculum and materials, global education, evaluation, research, and teacher training — were discussed by small groups of specialists in these areas. The group members had each prepared position papers on one of these topics in advance of the meeting. These and reaction statements by appointed reactors formed the basis of the discussions. Each committee finally prepared a joint statement which expressed the group consensus on the topic in question. The position papers, the reactor statements and the consensus statements were published by ACTFL (Lange 1980).

The committee on curriculum and materials had at its disposal five position papers prepared by Robert Lafayette and Lorraine Strasheim (Indiana University), Wilga Rivers (Harvard University), H.H. Stern (The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education), Albert Valdman (Indiana University), and Robert Zais (Kent State University) as well as two reactor papers by Carol Sparks (Mount Diablo, Calif., Unified School District) and Helen Warriner-Burke (Virginia Department of Education). These papers were discussed at the conference in a small group meeting attended by the writers of the position and the reactor papers and a few others.

At the end of the session the consensus paper was drafted and later circulated to the writers of the position papers and revised in accordance with their suggestions. This consensus paper (referred to as the "Boston paper") is reproduced as an appendix to this article (see pp. 144 ff). The four position papers on curriculum and materials by Rivers, Stern, Valdman, and Zais and the reactor paper by Warriner-Burke can be found in the *Proceedings* of the 1980 conference (Lange 1980).

In 1981 I was invited by ACTFL to elaborate my position paper and the Boston paper on curriculum and materials into a more detailed working document on which further discussion of the foreign language curriculum could be based. This is the origin of the present Report. In writing it I have based myself not only on the Boston paper and the other documents of the curriculum group but also on studies which I have made over a number of years on questions of the foreign language curriculum in

the Modern Language Centre of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in Toronto, Canada.[1]

The Concept of a Multidimensional Curriculum

As a glance at the Boston paper will show the participants at the Professional Priorities Conference recommended a "multidimensional" foreign language curriculum or, as others have called it, a multiple-focus curriculum (e.g., Allen 1969). Such a curriculum stands in contrast to current curricula at the school level which can be characterized as largely unidimensional. They are, in the words of the Boston paper, "based on a situational-structural syllabus". The multidimensional curriculum recommended by the Boston paper would be based on four types of "syllabuses": (1) a linguistic syllabus, (2) a cultural syllabus, (3) a communicative syllabus, and (4) a general language education syllabus. With this brief explanation in mind, readers should refer to the Boston paper in the appendix in order to be clear on what each of the syllabuses is intended to cover.

TERMINOLOGY

For the purpose of these discussions we have adopted the term "curriculum" to refer to the total scheme of content, objectives, and methodology. The components of the curriculum content require each their own "syllabus." That is a description of the content arranged in progressive stages, under each of the four categories. Thus, the French curriculum would comprise a French linguistic syllabus, a French cultural syllabus, a syllabus of French communicative activities, and, finally, a general language education component. For each foreign language one would envisage these four syllabuses. The general language education syllabus which, by definition, transcends the language-specific syllabuses can be planned jointly as well as illustrated by examples from the different language syllabuses.

THE FOUR CONTENT CATEGORIES: WHAT IS NEW ABOUT THEM?

The heart of the proposal lies in the provision of four major content categories or syllabuses. At a superficial glance there is nothing new in each of these categories, and it is certainly not for the sake of novelty that this proposal has been adopted in the Boston paper. Each of the components of the scheme has on and off formed part of the thinking on foreign language curricula, and has received more or less attention from time to time. One has only to look at *Northeast Conference Reports* from their inception in 1954 down to the present to confirm that the areas covered by the four syllabuses have been recognized as important by the language teaching profession for many decades.[2]

For example, "area studies" in USA in the 1940s or "European studies" in UK in the 1960s and 1970s emphasized what in the present scheme is called the cultural syllabus. But this emphasis was often achieved at the expense of language, and the criticism levelled against these curricula was that they were social studies curricula (or pejoratively, travellers' tales) and no longer provided an effective language training. These efforts were unidimensional and deliberately shifted emphasis from language to culture.

In other language courses the value of culture and of communicative activities as components of a language curriculum was also often acknowledged; but in the main language programs have been linguistic and structural as evidenced in course materials and classroom practice at the school level. They have been concerned with phonology, morphology, and syntax presented as "the four skills" usually in a situational framework. The content of the other syllabuses, even where it was acknowledged, particularly the cultural component, received little *systematic* attention and was considered subsidiary to the linguistic component.

The proposal in the Boston paper implies (1) a more systematic approach to the other syllabuses equivalent to the linguistic syllabus, (2) a weighting of the emphasis in curriculum design which is more evenly spread across the different components, and (3) an integration of the four syllabuses. *The overall intention is to provide a more powerful foreign language curriculum than has been possible within a unidimensional curriculum design.*

WHAT HAS PROMPTED A MULTIDIMENSIONAL APPROACH?

There are historical, theoretical, and policy-related considerations that can be identified.[3]

Historical considerations. The notion of a multidimensional foreign language curriculum as a guiding concept for the future is an outcome of developments that have taken place during the past twenty years. In the 1960s language teaching was preoccupied with the question of teaching method, in particular with the audiolingual-cognitive controversy. To some extent this preoccupation with method continued into the 1970s and yielded an interest in a spate of new methods (e.g., Total Physical Response, Suggestopedia, Community Language Learning, the Dartmouth Method, the Natural Method, etc.), but eventually the consensus of the profession has led to what Grittner in the 1977 edition of his book on language teaching and Rivers in the 1981 edition of *Teaching Foreign Language Skills* have referred to as an eclectic approach. There is no single methodological formula that is the key to language learning. Or, to put it more positively, to teach a foreign language effectively we need a multiplicity of strategies.

A significant section of the profession in the 1970s came to the conclusion that the main issue is not the "how" of language teaching, *teaching method*, but the "what for" and "what", curriculum *objectives* and *content*. An outstanding experiment in this regard was the Council of Europe Threshold Level project; it firmly placed definition of needs, objectives, and linguistic content in the centre of attention.

During the 1970s, arising from these curriculum questions, there was a great deal of experimentation with different types of curricula or syllabuses: structural, situational, topical, and notional-functional.[4] Even the non-syllabus, i.e., the abandonment of any guiding principles of progression, was advocated. On the question of curriculum design, just as in methodology, what appeared at first as mutually exclusive innovations in the end came to be recognized as complementary approaches to the curriculum and gave rise to the idea of a multiple curriculum (e.g., Corder 1973, Stern, Ullmann, *et al* 1980).

Several other influences, which were referred to in the position papers for the Boston conference, are also relevant to the proposal: the widened concept of language learning reflected in semantics, sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics, research on

language e.g., Krashen's distinction between learning and acquisition (Krashen 1981, 1981a) and the various developments which have crystallized around the concept of "communicative approaches to language teaching".[5] Of particular importance has been the conviction that has received much support from research that even in a language learning situation genuine communication on matters of interest and concern to the learner and worthwhile subject matter involving learners in actual and authentic language use can make a direct contribution to language learning, and that such communicative activities should not be delayed until the end of the course (as was presupposed in the curricula of the 1960s and early 1970s). An innovation of this period which illustrated this principle was French immersion in Canada. It demonstrated that worthwhile subject matter and a truly meaningful activity such as learning a subject in the foreign language can be an extremely useful vehicle of language learning with important implications for regular classroom language teaching.[6]

The foreign language curriculum proposed in the Boston paper is in many ways an attempt at a synthesis of these developments of the 1960s and 1970s: it makes a case for a move away from unidimensional curricula and a unidimensional teaching methodology to multidimensional approaches to curriculum content, objectives, and methodology.

Theoretical considerations. On theoretical grounds a multiple approach is more defensible, too, because it reflects the social nature and cultural embeddedness of language much better than a unidimensional purely linguistic approach. Moreover, if the psychology of language learning recognizes certain commonalities between first language acquisition, second language learning in natural settings, and second language learning in the classroom, the curriculum should reflect these characteristics of language learning. From this point of view both a cultural and a communicative syllabus become essentials in language teaching as much as a more formal approach. A narrowly linguistic focus (verbs, drills, structures and vocabulary) in isolation is not only ineffective, it is also theoretically unsound.

Policy-related considerations. On grounds of educational policy, a narrowly conceived foreign language curriculum makes an inadequate contribution to schooling and therefore cannot compete on equal terms with more substantial curriculum subjects such as the natural sciences, history, or geography. Students can intuitively sense the differences when they describe their French course as "five years of 'Bonjour' " (Ullmann 1981) and express their dissatisfaction by opting out of languages, if the skills required are too limited and too repetitive, and the substance of the program appears trivial and irrelevant. A multidimensional curriculum offers the chance of a much more substantial and educationally valuable program of greater interest and appeal to teachers and students.

What Next? The Development of a Multidimensional Curriculum

If, then, we assume that a multiple approach to the foreign language curriculum is desirable, what has to be done to implement it? The main task is to set in motion the

development of the four different syllabuses. There are certain aspects to consider which apply to all the syllabuses, others which are specific to each one separately. There are questions concerning integration of the syllabuses into a coherent curriculum since, presumably, the intention is not to teach four different subjects under the aegis of a foreign language, but to regard each syllabus as a component of one curriculum area. These are the main concerns of this Report. Beyond them there are other questions which can only be briefly mentioned in the conclusion to the Report: there are questions of implementation, research and experimentation, materials development, evaluation, and teacher education, if the multidimensional approach is to be effectively applied in the foreign language classrooms of the future. To begin with, we shall consider questions which apply across the different syllabus areas and after that comment briefly on each of the different syllabuses.

DEVELOPMENT BY GRADUAL APPROXIMATION

Although the concerns represented by the different syllabuses are familiar to foreign language teachers there are few precedents to go on except in the area of the linguistic syllabus. Therefore we have to recognize that a multiple curriculum is breaking new ground and treat it as a long-term development which should be thought of as taking several years to put into operation. Progress should be made by gradual approximation rather than by attempts to produce ideal syllabuses from one day to the next or at some specific end date. If we are prepared to regard a multidimensional curriculum as a long-term development we ought to consider, from the outset, certain short-term measures which make an immediate impact partly to gain experience of the innovation and partly not to delay what should be made known as a promising departure. The preparation of the various syllabuses will entail fundamental and applied research, the drafting of tentative outlines and sketches, practical experimentation, and evaluation. Some of the work to be done is sufficiently general that it transcends the different languages, but some will be language specific, or specific to given school backgrounds, age levels or types of experience.

As an example from my own experience I would cite the Module Making Project of the OISE Modern Language Centre mentioned previously in note 1. This project was intended as long-term curriculum research and development (R&D). But the modules produced within this project were developed in such a way that they could be immediately applied in schools today and could therefore demonstrate on a restricted scale by way of concrete examples the intention of the project as a whole (Stern, Ullmann, *et al*, 1980).

EXPANSION OR REDUCTION?

The idea of a multiple approach to the curriculum may be widely welcomed, but an objection to it that one is likely to meet is the following: "This is all very well as an idea, but our language courses are far too short. We haven't the time to expand the curriculum in so many directions." This argument assumes that the linguistic component is a fixed and unalterable entity. However, the assumption on which a multidimensional conception of the curriculum is based is that approaching the language from the different angles of each syllabus will reinforce the other syllabuses and not detract from them. The time not spent on the language component is not time wasted. On the contrary the language syllabus is likely to be strengthened if it is supported by the other three syllabuses.

At the same time, it is necessary, as the Valdman position paper (Valdman 1980) shows, to be economical in what to include. In the language area Valdman indicates certain economies that could be made by focusing more on the linguistic essentials for learners and, because of the time constraints, by not attempting to attain, in the pursuit of "communicative competence", a level of achievement which is outside the learner's capability. Economy is also needed in the other syllabuses, although for them the problem is not — for the present — that they offer "too much;" it is much more that they offer "too little."

RESOURCES

To begin with, in each syllabus area a thorough search of existing know-how, research data, practices, experiences, materials, and relevant theoretical statements should be made so as to build upon past experience and achievement. The search should not be confined to language teaching experience in USA. Relevant work on the linguistic syllabus, for example, as was noted above, can be found in Europe. Canadian immersion experience can contribute to the concept of a communicative syllabus. Scanning the literature and sifting it, examining existing teaching materials, seeking out reports on practical experiments in the different curriculum areas are essential preliminaries for making a more systematic approach to the different syllabuses.

PROGRESSION AND STAGES

Since we are concerned with the development of a *curriculum* we must face the question of how to handle progression and stages of learning over a number of years. Unfortunately the arrangement of a curriculum in a sequential order which makes pedagogical sense and which corresponds to natural linguistic and mental development is still an unresolved issue of language pedagogy. It has been debated for some twenty years. Several schemes are available. For example, interesting proposals have been made in the context of the Council of Europe Modern Languages Project. These should be examined as well as several recent experiments in Britain to divide the language learning process into a series of empirically defined mastery levels.[7] These are not pointed out here as models, but as examples of the kind of divisions and progressions that should be considered in curriculum development. The examples we have illustrate levels of attainment or progression in the *language* area. Corresponding progressions need to be worked out for the other three syllabuses. These will necessarily be tentative until more experience on syllabus development in these areas has been gathered.

THE FOUR CONTENT AREAS

In the following sections, each of the four syllabuses will be discussed in turn. It is of course important, as has already been pointed out and as we shall again emphasize in the section on integration, not to treat each syllabus as a separate entity in isolation. However, treating them as relatively distinct from each other is a useful division of labour and offers the possibility of giving all four areas the concentrated and specialized attention they need if they are to be developed as powerful components of the foreign language curriculum. The descriptions in the Boston paper (see Appendix) will give an indication of the different types of content to be covered.[8] In this Report I can refer only to a few major issues in each of the content areas.

The linguistic syllabus. In this syllabus we focus on the language as an object of study and practice. It is the traditional core of language teaching. The main issue for syllabus development in the coming years is the expansion of linguistic analysis into the study of language "use" rather than "usage" (Widdowson, 1978). Consequently it includes speech acts, discourse, notions, and functions. There are a number of examples of syllabuses in which the emphasis has shifted from mainly structural principles to mainly functional (semantic/pragmatic/sociolinguistic) content.[9] This shift in content has also been reflected in the shift in the expression of the proficiency objective as *communicative* rather than as *linguistic* competence.[10]

The question, then, arises whether the functional, notional, or situational categories replace the grammatical ones. The general answer to this question has been "no", but it has immediately given rise to the question of what should be the relationship between the structural and the functional components of the language syllabus. Brumfit (1980), for example, had argued persuasively for retaining grammar as the central core of the language syllabus and allowing notions and functions to snake around the "natural" grammatical progression in a spiral form. J.P.B. Allen (1980) has developed a three-level language curriculum model in which level 1 is structural, level 2 is functional, and level 3 is instrumental or experiential. According to this scheme, the relevant levels for the linguistic syllabus are the structural level with a focus on formal features, and the functional level with an emphasis on discourse features.[11]

In planning the development of this syllabus within the context of a multidimensional curriculum, two issues have to be addressed: (1) how to do justice to the structural and functional components of a language, and how to integrate them with one another,[12] and (2) how to exercise an appropriate economy so that, in spite of a wider view of the linguistic syllabus, the syllabus does not become overloaded; in fact it should be reduced in comparison to traditional language syllabuses. Among the position papers for the Priorities Conference as was pointed out above (p. 120), Valdman's paper (1980) has particularly addressed itself to this issue of the language syllabus. He proposes a carefully designed cyclical gradation, a reduction of the linguistic demands on the learner by simplification, lexical reduction, the use of invariant analytical forms, and by giving the design of the syllabus a deliberately functional and discourse focus.

A worthwhile proposal to be considered for the language syllabus is the British one which was referred to above (p. 121). The proposal has two essential features:

(1) Instead of thinking of language proficiency in monolithic terms, the language proficiency to be attained is divided into progressive mastery levels on the analogy of music examinations. Students are encouraged to move from one mastery level to the next one up, knowing in advance what objectives the mastery level implies.

(2) Each mastery level is expressed in terms of concrete speech events which are relevant to the kind of language uses students are likely to engage in as a result of language learning. Thus at the first mastery level the student is expected to demonstrate the ability to deal successfully in the second language with:

- asking the way and understanding directions

- shopping for food, souvenirs and stamps
- going to a café, etc.

On the basis of similar specifications it should be possible to develop an inventory of language items in structural and functional terms and to arrange them in a graded fashion.[13]

My interpretation of desirable future developments in the language area can be summarized as follows:

(1) a linguistic syllabus is needed for any form of language instruction,
(2) such a syllabus must contain structural and functional elements (in other words, a syllabus which is expressed purely in terms of grammatical forms and vocabulary is inadequate, equally a syllabus which ignores the structural component), and
(3) a structural-functional syllabus can probably best be arrived at by working backwards from previously selected mastery level topics, situations, and skills (but the mere listing of these topics, situations and skills does not constitute an adequate linguistic syllabus, although it is a necessary step in that direction).

The cultural syllabus. This syllabus can be thought of as analagous to the linguistic one in that it provides an introduction to the sociocultural context to the second language itself. Culture, in this syllabus, like language in the previous one, is therefore an abstraction. It is treated as an object which can be observed, examined and analyzed. The language learner in this syllabus is an observer (not a participant) of social relations and institutions. He acquires knowledge about them and thus familiarizes himself with the society and its activities in which the language is used. He can also practice and acquire "proficiency" where this is appropriate. Thus, one can learn by explanation how it is customary to greet a stranger or how one should conduct oneself in ordering a meal in a restaurant or in taking part in a family dinner. Appropriate objectives of this syllabus are the acquisition of cultural awareness, understanding, knowledge, and, to a certain extent, cultural "proficiency". The language and culture syllabuses are closely interrelated and support each other (see section on integration below, pp. 133-8).

Recognition of culture. While culture has been recognized for a long time as an important component of foreign language curricula exemplified in the well-known books by Brooks, Chastain, Rivers, and Grittner, and there have been many useful publications on culture teaching,[14] the cultural component in the language context has, to my knowledge, not been treated as a "syllabus" with its own defined content, progression and mastery levels equivalent to the language syllabus.[15] In the past it has generally been regarded as subsidiary to the language component. Some ten years ago, Jakobovits made a plea for treating biculturalism as indeed more important than learning the mechanics of a language.[16]

The area reference. Culture teaching should have a specified area reference. That is, it should make explicit attempts to introduce students to countries or areas where the target language is used as well as to ethnolinguistic groups who use this language in North America. *One important task for the development of these syllabuses is to identify more clearly than has been customary the geographic distribution of the speech communities to which to relate the teaching of a particular second language,*

to develop criteria for choices among these, and to consider the implication of choices for syllabus content.[17]

Definition of cultural topics. One of the main difficulties in culture teaching is the vastness and lack of definition of the topics to be covered. How can this difficulty be overcome? We note three possible approaches.

(1) One approach has been to adopt classification schemes of the kind suggested in the position paper by Lafayette and Strasheim (1980) who proposed five categories taken from Pfister and colleagues:[18]

(a) The Family Unit and the Personal Sphere
- family relationships
- eating and shopping
- housing

(b) The Social Sphere
- class structure
- work
- leisure
- attitudes towards sex
- population

(c) Political Systems and Institutions
- government
- education
- law and justice

(d) Environmental Sphere
- geography (physical and political)
- economic development
- urban vs. rural
- natural resources/environment
- weather

(e) Religion, the Arts and the Humanities
- role of churches
- folklore and history
- literature, music, creative arts

Such schemes are useful as inventories, but they are not necessarily easy to apply, nor are they always appropriate at the school level. *Several such schemes should be examined, compared, and discussed as possible bases for syllabus development.*

(2) A second approach consists of selecting, on the basis of knowledge of the target country or countries, certain cultural topics which have particular educational value and can be said to be relevant to students.

(3) A third possibility would be to use the language mastery levels, discussed in the previous syllabus, as a basis and to focus on those aspects of culture that relate to the linguistic uses that have already been specified, e.g., shopping, eating, host-guest relations, towns, roads, post office, etc.

Absence of research. A major problem of all culture teaching is the lack of a well established data base in research on culture and society of most target language

countries. This is a deficiency that university language departments should be urged to make good. Without such studies culture teaching is likely to remain a relatively undeveloped, improvised, and unsophisticated activity, and teachers will find it difficult to overcome the danger of stereotyping.

Teachers have been urged to use "discovery" procedures and to train their students as language learners to gain cultural knowledge through finding things out for themselves. Such self-help is valuable particularly in the absence of research data and established documentation. But in my view teachers do not have the necessary skill to make such enquiries or to guide their students to do so. These recommendations are often overoptimistic. In any case, however useful discovery techniques are, they are no substitute for systematic research on cultural aspects.

In order to meet the demand for cultural syllabus development, the curriculum developer has to explore whatever reliable sources are accessible and establish *cultural guides* which would form the basis for a cultural syllabus and materials development.

On certain cultural topics which are known to be important it is possible to develop small independent and specific units — capsules/modules — which can be based on research, specifically undertaken for the capsule or module in question.

Thus, the Module Making Project, mentioned above (see note 1), has selected cultural topics in the teaching of French as a second language in Canada. These topics would otherwise not be in the language program or could only be superficially dealt with by teachers. Each of these is based on extensive substantive enquiries and is fully documented. The emphasis of the modules has been mainly on Québec culture, of obvious importance to Canadian learners of French as a second language. Other French-speaking areas of Canada are also dealt with. For instance, *Le temps des fêtes* deals with the Christmas holiday in Québec; *Le Temps des sucres* deals with the harvesting of maple sugar both as a tradition and as an industry. Some modules deal with the sights and life in Montréal and Québec. Two modules consist of interviews with francophone teenagers. Three modules are artistic: two deal with the music of the Québec chansonniers, and one with the art of an Acadian poet and singer, Edith Butler. Two modules are political and cover the life and ideas about separation and confederation of two leading politicians, Lévesque and Trudeau.[19]

This approach does not constitute or replace a full-scale cultural syllabus; but where the whole spectrum of cultural data is inadequately covered, it is better to undertake a fuller treatment of specified limited cultural topics based on a thorough investigation of the subject in question, than to attempt a broad, comprehensive cultural coverage which lacks documentation and which cannot be regarded as reliable.

While a sound philosophy of culture teaching is readily available today (e.g., Rivers 1981, chapter 11) and one can also find concrete examples for various languages and countries (see Lafayette 1978) a great deal of sifting and sorting will have to be done, and the conversion of the wealth of ideas and practices into a viable and valid progressive syllabus is a task still to be undertaken within the context of foreign language curriculum development.

Communicative syllabus. For this syllabus we change focus. Language or culture are no longer treated as objects to observe, study, or exercise. The student now becomes a participant who uses the language for some purpose and who involves himself in

activities which actually or vicariously bring him into contact with life in a target language community. Living, learning, or working in the target language community are obvious ways of providing this kind of contact experience. But since not everyone can be moved into the foreign language situation other ways have to be found to provide contact experiences and opportunities for authentic communication. What is intended, as I pointed out in my position paper (Stern 1980), is not so much physical movement of individuals as a meeting of minds. Hence educationally valid subject matter and content of real concern to the learner is vital for this focus.

The principle of this syllabus has been well recognized for centuries. Even Montaigne's father knew that by using the language in day-to-day activities in the home a child would learn the language. The direct method, by employing the language in the classroom, implied the same expectations. Student exchanges and pen friendships have been part of language programs since the 1930s, at least in Europe. What is new is the claim implicit in this syllabus that the communicative component should not be treated as a reward, an extra for good students. It should not be delayed until the language has been learned. It should itself be used as a way of learning the second language. It is through experiences of this kind that a foreign language learner acquires "communication strategies" and coping techniques which help him to survive in the second language and culture environment, and which train him to handle the impact of an imperfectly known language.

To convert this idea into a syllabus the curriculum developer needs in the first place an inventory of communicative activities which truly engage learners in communication. On the basis of this inventory we can develop an experiential/participant syllabus which complements the linguistic and cultural syllabuses.

There is no clear boundary between language learning activities which form part of the linguistic syllabus and those which belong to the communicative syllabus. If the emphasis is mainly on language the activity can be subsumed under the linguistic syllabus. If it is mainly on the theme, topic or activity and away from language it belongs to the communicative syllabus. In the communicative syllabus the activity is recognized as worthwhile in its own right and the language aspect is subsidiary to the demands of the topic or situation. Even if the teaching pays attention to language items (grammatical structure, vocabulary, stylistic features or intonation), as long as it is done for the sake of the action, topic or situation, it is communicative in the sense of the communicative syllabus.[20]

Communicative activities can be roughly classified as follows in descending order from the most (1.1) to the least (2.6) communicative:

1. *Field experience*

   1.1 Arrangements are made for learners to enter into or make *contact with the second language environment* through (a) travel, (b) residence, (c) exchange schemes, and (d) work and study in second language environment, or (e) correspondence.[21]

   Contact experiences can develop spontaneously, but in most instances do not arise automatically. They have to be regulated, especially when large numbers of students are involved. These experiences almost invariably involve learners in communication with an emphasis on "message" rather than on "medium".

1.2 *Contrived arrangements*
The creation of a second language environment which provides an opportunity for second language use: (a) total or partial immersion, (b) curriculum subject (other than the second language, taught in the second language, (c) second language school, (d) second language house, with pledge to use the second language (e.g., Middlebury), (e) second language day/weekend or camp. Teaching a subject or part of the curriculum in the second language provides excellent opportunities for its use, illustrated well by immersion education.

2. *Creation of communicative situations within second language class* (Krumm 1980)
   2.1 *Class management* and routine exchanges in the second language.
   2.2 *Communications* within the second language class (instruction, other interaction) in the second language at all times/at selected periods.
   2.3 *Inviting native speakers* into the second language class: exchange students, visitors.
   2.4 Situations, topics and activities (high in student interest or educational value) presented through books, modules (kits, LAPs) or multimedia with focus mainly on the situation, topic, or activity (language focus instrumental to topic).
   2.5 *Emphasis on human relations* in the second language class; creating an interactive social climate through personal exchanges in which participants get to know each other while working and playing together (Moskowitz 1978).
   2.6 *Deliberately created communicative activities:* simulations, role playing, group discussions, case studies, communicative games.

The activities at the lower end of this classification merge into communicative practice based on functional analysis, and contextualized structural practice which have a communicative aspect but are devised mainly for the sake of linguistic practice (and therefore belong to the linguistic syllabus).

Examples

(1) Robert Lafayette (1981) has devised a program on cultural topics in French at university level, thus combining an activity in the cultural and communicative syllabuses. This course emphasises cultural information and discussion, and at the same time it enhances language proficiency as a by-product through talk in French about worthwhile subject-matter.

(2) The OISE modules which were listed as examples of cultural content in the previous syllabus also illustrate within the communicative syllabus thematic content (2.4) as a means of establishing communicative experiences.

(3) Another OISE module, entitled *Le Hockey*, is based on the widespread interest of students at school level in hockey and their familiar-

> ity with the game. The module is performed through a card game which uses (and thereby teaches) hockey terms in French. It also encourages and prepares for the watching of hockey on television and listening to the French hockey commentaries available on Canadian French-speaking television or radio stations.[22]

Through communicative activities the learner has the opportunity of using the second language in genuine communication (receptive and productive) and of making contact with target language speakers or texts. Further illustrations of communicative activities are in Littlewood (1981) and Moskowitz (1978). For the present there is little experience to draw on for a systematically designed syllabus of communicative activities, nor is there much empirical research.

General language education syllabus. The three syllabuses we have considered cover a particular second language and culture so as to relate particular learners to them both. While this may be sufficient for a strong curriculum, an asset of a second language program, particularly at high school or university level, is the possibility of acquiring knowledge about language, culture, and society *in general*, and thus obtain a deeper language, social and international education which can give the second language learner a general awareness of language and language learning as well as of other languages and countries, and thus contribute to a student's global education.[23] Language learning gives rise to questions of language, culture and society. It leads to comparisons between languages and prompts thoughts about the value of language. A general language education syllabus would channel these thoughts and enable students to generalize beyond the particular foreign language they are studying. This has been a neglected area of foreign language education, but a few attempts have been made to develop syllabuses of this kind.

We can envisage *preparatory* general language programs which precede a second language program; *incidental general language observations* accompanying the other syllabuses; or a deliberately developed *general language education syllabus* in its own right, based on linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, and sociocultural information. Such a course could be associated with the foreign language program or placed between foreign and native language education.

From time to time suggestions have been made to introduce such programs, and in the literature a few examples can be found.[24] Recent efforts can be illustrated by a kit, issued in Canada by the Commissioner of Official Languages, the federal language ombudsman whose task it is to watch over bilingualism in Canada. While the Commissioner's main concern is French-English bilingualism, the kit was produced to sensitize young Canadians at the high school level (approximately 13-17 year olds) to questions of language in general and to the spread of English and French, Canada's two official languages, across the world. From the point of view of this syllabus this kit is worth examining. It consists of a world language game, in which the winner has gained points by "possessing" many languages, and with the help of these languages the player has made himself at home in cities across the world: for he becomes an "honorary citizen" of those cities whose languages he possesses (i.e., the language cards he holds). The kit for this game also contains a world map of languages and a short information handbook about language and languages. Although this kit has some flaws, it makes at least an attempt to deal with some of the topics we can envisage

in a general language education syllabus.

Another example of an attempt to introduce a general language syllabus was outlined by Hawkins (1981:305-6) in his recent book on language teaching. Hawkins emphasizes the need for a "bridge" between first and second language teaching; for giving students insight into the role of language in social life so as to counteract prejustice; and for prompting a lifelong interest in language and "especially in the responsibility of parents for the language development of children in the pre-school years." Hawkins' general language education syllabus has four themes. Under each theme he has listed a number of topics and student activities. The first theme deals with the nature of language, the second with aspects of linguistic structure, the third with language in use, language varieties and comparisons, and the fourth with first and second language acquisition. Hawkins' outline illustrates well the kind of content that might be included in a general language education syllabus.

Apart from examining examples of this kind, a useful approach to this syllabus might include an enquiry on what general questions on language, culture and society frequently arise in language classes. One might also canvass the opinions of teachers on the question of what general aspects of language or culture are particularly important for students to know about.

Among topics to include the following should receive consideration:

- Languages across the world (language map).
- The distinction between language and dialect.
- The notion of standard and variation.
- Language prejudices.
- The relationship between language and thought.
- The role of language in society.
- Bilingualism and multilingualism.
- Learning how to learn a language.
- Grammars and dictionaries.
- The origin of languages.
- The language development of children.
- Animal language.
- Other modes of communication.
- The place of the particular second language in relation to other languages.

In my view the following considerations are particularly important in devising this syllabus: one is to create a link between first and second language teaching; another is the value for students to learn how to learn a language efficiently so that their language learning at school can be generalized to the learning of other languages; a third would be that they should be sensitized to questions of language and society and can therefore approach ethnic and linguistic diversity in North America and internationally without prejudice.

Integration

The integration of the four syllabuses is a key issue for the future development of the language curriculum. Without it there is the danger that, in practice, the foreign

language curriculum becomes overloaded and cannot be handled in the limited time periods available. Another danger is that four different areas are studied under the aegis of the foreign language in an unrelated fashion. Finally, because of these difficulties, the greatest danger is that teachers fall back on the accustomed language syllabus and only pay lip service to the other three syllabuses. How can these risks be met from the outset?

RECOGNIZE THE COMPLEMENTARY NATURE OF THE SYLLABUSES

In the first instance, it is vital for teachers to realize that the four syllabuses complement each other and that there are no hard-and-fast boundaries between them. The different syllabuses each represent a shift of perspective. Thus, the linguistic syllabus focuses on the second language, the cultural syllabus on the speech communities and the country or region where the language is used. The linguistic and cultural syllabuses together treat the language and culture as objects of study. The communicative syllabus demands a change of role: the learner becomes participant. In the general education syllabus the learner's perspective is changed once more. He stands back from the foreign language and looks at language in general in a more detached frame of mind. The shift of perspective can occur momentarily during a lesson. It can also become a shift of focus or emphasis over long stretches of time. Thus, Allen (1980) has proposed a shift of focus within the language syllabus from structure to function and between the linguistic syllabus (both structure and function) and the communicative syllabus (communicative-experiential).[25] In any case a multidimensional approach offers an element of change and shift of interest, which could be more stimulating for the teacher and the student than a unidimensional approach and, in the long run, provides a more valid and substantial language education without detracting in any way from a second language proficiency objective.

BUILD BRIDGES FROM SYLLABUS TO SYLLABUS

We noted already that, as a matter of economy and division of labour, it is advisable to tackle the development of the syllabuses separately. For example, different committees or individuals with specialist interests could be asked to prepare different syllabuses for each second language under consideration. But when suggestions of syllabus development are prepared *each syllabus writer of one syllabus would immediately be urged to bear the other three syllabus areas in mind, to make cross references to them, and to alert the other syllabus developers to such cross references so as to obviate compartmentalization from the start.*

Example. Forms of address — the *tu-vous* distinction — are grammatical forms in the linguistic syllabus but are culturally relevant distinctions in human relations in the speech communities of the target language and as such belong to the cultural syllabus; these cross references should be sought out whenever possible.[26]

DEVELOP AND USE TEACHING MATERIALS WHICH CUT ACROSS THE SYLLABUS DIVISIONS

Another way of integrating the different syllabuses is by the use of teaching materials which are focused on one syllabus but clearly relate to another as well, or by developing teaching materials with a focus on those syllabus areas which in the past have been neglected and therefore deserve emphasis today in order to create a better balance.

In the OISE Module Making Project we have for some years been aware of the fact that Canadian curricula in French as a second language confine themselves largely to *language* progression, and we have therefore produced modules with an emphasis on the other syllbuses or integrating language aspects with the other areas. Our object has been to shift the emphasis gradually away from a narrowly linguistic progression, to stress cultural themes and to demonstrate at the same time that the linguistic progression does not suffer. On the contrary it is enriched by the other emphases.

Example 1. One module *Devant le micro* presents interviews with French Canadian teenagers talking about their lives, their families, and their own personal futures. Such a module can clearly be used as an example of a-way-of-life activity in the *cultural syllabus*. It has obviously a *language* interest because it consists of recordings of spontaneous, unrehearsed talk, and provides training in listening comprehension. This module can also be regarded as relevant to the communicative syllabus (communicative activities). It prepares students mentally and vicariously for exchange visits.

The same tape recordings have been used as examples of Canadian French in another module, *Le français parlé au Canada*. This kit aims to sensitize students to Canadian French, particularly to its phonological features. This module therefore can be described as linguistic or sociolinguistic (linguistic syllabus): it gives students an opportunity to learn about French dialect and dialect features. At the same time this module (1) suggests discussions about language, dialect, and Canadian French and (2) gives information about speech sounds. It therefore falls also into the general language education syllabus. However, this general information is not treated abstractly and out of context. It arises quite naturally from the purpose of this taped material.

Example 2. An ESL module, *The Golden Horseshoe*, which is addressed to ESL students at school level illustrates a school subject approach, in this case geography, which provides training in the language used in geography. From one point of view it deals with geography (an area of southern Ontario), from another it is English and helps ESL students to handle English in a geographical context. It thus belongs to both the linguistic syllabus as well as to the communicative syllabus, and some of the information in the module fits into the cultural syllabus.[27]

START FROM ONE SYLLABUS AND WORK TOWARDS THE OTHERS

Another approach to integration can be envisaged in the following manner: the curriculum developers define mastery levels in terms of usable proficiency skills or knowledge (linguistic syllabus). The British example of three mastery levels (see p. 126) above) can serve as an illustration. The syllabus as proposed defines linguistic and sociolinguistic stages of proficiency and, as suggested above, structural and functional inventories could be based on these within the linguistic syllabus. For each of the linguistic topics listed, an inventory of relevant sociocultural topics (the cultural syllabus) and communicative activities (the communicative syllabus) can be prepared.

It is equally possible to proceed from the other syllabuses as starting points in answer to the following questions:

The cultural syllabus. What knowledge about the country, people, society, and culture should be made available at given stages of the second language?

The communicative syllabus. In what significant language-related experiences should students participate?

The general education syllabus. What general knowledge about language, culture, and society should students become acquainted with at a given stage?

In short, it is possible to work from the linguistic syllabus to the other three syllabuses just as it is possible to start from the cultural syllabus and so on. In other words, one could use any of the syllabuses as a starting point and work out its implications for the other three.

PLACE THE FOUR SYLLABUSES WITHIN AN INTEGRATED MODEL OF A FOREIGN LANGUAGE CURRICULUM

Finally, a conceptual integration can be achieved if we represent content, objectives, and strategy options in a single model (Fig. 1). Such an integrated model is not

Content	Objectives				Main strategies
	Proficiency	Knowledge	Affect	Transfer	
Language Syllabus (second language)	Suggested MAJOR Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Analytical: Study & Practical
Culture Syllabus (second culture)	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested MAJOR Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Analytical: Study (knowledge about second culture)
Communicative Activity Syllabus (second language and culture)	Suggested MAJOR Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Communicative Activities (Experiential)
General Language Education Syllabus	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested Minor Emphasis	Suggested MAJOR Emphasis	Comparative (Crosslingual/ Crosscultural)

Fig. 1. A Foreign Language Curriculum Model

unfamiliar to language teachers. It is a modification of the curriculum specifications that Rebecca Valette developed around 1970 (e.g., Valette 1971). Such a model can express not only the multidimensionality of the foreign language curriculum content but also the multiplicity of major and minor *objectives* and of associated *teaching strategies*.

Following the twofold divisions developed by Valette the horizontal divisions in the model represent categories of learning objectives expressed in customary psychological or behavioural terms derived from the Bloom taxonomies. In the model the *objectives* are expressed in four major classes:

(1) proficiency
(2) knowledge

(3) affective learning (values and attitudes)
(4) transfer (learning beyond the language given).

Classes (1) to (3) have an obvious similarity to the domains of the Bloom taxonomy. Class (4), transfer, represents the same three classes (1) to (3) on a more generalized level. The four *content categories* in the model are the syllabuses we have just described.

This cross-classification advances from the most basic categories of content and objectives, i.e., proficiency in the language, to objectives which are more removed from this first objective but which may still play a part in many types of curricula, e.g., transfer. If language proficiency is absent as an objective, the curriculum can hardly be described as a *language* learning curriculum. But apart from that the classification does not of itself impose any strict order of priority.

This twofold system of categories can be applied differentially to the language learning needs and conditions of various groups of learners. Factors to be taken into account must be (1) the learner's age and stage of psychological maturity (including language background and previous language learning experience), (2) different stages of learning and teaching, and (3) differentiation of learning objectives according to differences in proficiency needs and purposes of the curriculum in question.

Associated with these content areas and objectives are *predominant strategies* which are largely derived from the method controversies and reflect in a systematic way the methodological eclecticism advocated by Grittner and Rivers. The essential options are

analytical ⟷ non-analytical

The linguistic, cultural, and general education syllabuses are mainly analytical as far as language and culture are concerned, that is these syllabuses are based on analyses of language and culture, and techniques of study and practice are predominant in the attempt to acquire proficiency and knowledge in these areas. The communicative syllabus is handled mainly non-analytically (experientially) for both language and culture.

On a second dimension

explicit ⟷ implicit

the choice is between a more or a less cognitive-intellectual approach to the learner. The general education syllabus is by definition highly explicit. As for the other three syllabuses, the degree of cognitive involvement is likely to vary with the maturity and intellectual level of learners, e.g., more implicit in the Kindergarten, more explicit in high school and university level classes.

Another important dimension is the option between

intralingual ⟷ **crosslingual**

intracultural (non-comparative) ⟷ **crosscultural** (comparative)

Thus the direct method is intralingual, a translation approach crosslingual. Any comparative techniques of relating the second language or culture to the first language or culture is crosslingual or crosscultural. The communicative syllabus is likely to be largely dealt with intralingually and intraculturally. The general education syllabus (general language education) is likely to involve crosslingual and crosscul-

tural comparisons. For the linguistic and cultural syllabus both strategy options can come into use at various stages of instruction.

Conclusion: The Implementation of the New Curriculum

The next phase in the development of a multiple curriculum is no doubt the description of the different syllabuses in particular languages for, say, high school language programs and their co-ordination into a unified curriculum. This task is likely to reveal gaps in knowledge and documentation which can only be filled by research on languages and cultures. Even though the information may not be perfect, it is advisable soon to proceed to materials development and classroom experimentation. The complexity of the multiple foreign language curriculum suggests as a useful format *curriculum guides* as handbooks for the teacher to provide rationale, coherence and sequence, supported, in the first instance, by existing materials for parts of the curriculum. For the syllabuses or parts of a syllabus, inadequately covered by existing materials, banks of relatively small specific kits of a modular kind might, secondly, be developed so as to establish gradually a balance in the components of the curriculum.

The multidimensional curriculum makes new demands on foreign language teachers which in the long run have implications for university courses and language teacher education, and in the immediate future are best met by active teacher involvement and in-service programs.

One would also hope that the implementation of a multidimensional curriculum is accompanied by classroom research and systematic formative evaluation.

If this renewal of the curriculum is to have any chance of success it is important to learn from previous innovations on language teaching and to avoid some of the errors that have been made in the introduction of the language laboratory, FLES, the audiolingual approach, and so on. The multidimensional curriculum which we are at present exploring has sound theoretical foundations; it makes historical sense, and it has educational merit. If we set about it circumspectly it has every chance of succeeding and of contributing to the advancement of language learning in the 1980s.

Notes

1. The conceptions underlying the work on curriculum issues I have been involved in have been developed over many years going back to the early seventies (e.g., Stern, 1973). They have found concrete expression and application in the products of the French Modules Project of the Modern Language Centre of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). This project, under the leadership of Rebecca Ullmann, Research Associate and Principal Investigator of the Modules Project, has focused on the theoretical issues and, simultaneously, has produced concrete illustrations of the multidimensional approach to curriculum, described in the present article. See Stern 1976, 1980a, 1982, 1983 (ch. 22); Stern, Ullmann, *et al*, 1980; Ullmann 1981, 1982. See also note 19 below.

2. Questions of curriculum and materials have been taken up again and again almost

annually in the *Northeast Conference Reports*. Several *Reports* have directly contributed to the discussion on curriculum and materials, such as a challenging questionnaire on the relevance of the curriculum to the "new" student, designed by Jakobovits for the 1970 Northeast Conference (Tursi 1970), the 1975 discussion on curriculum goals (Born 1975), and the eloquent demand for authenticity of content at the 1978 Northeast Conference (Born 1978). See also Lafayette's "Toward an Articulated Curriculum" in the 1980 *Reports* (Geno 1980), or the Reports on materials and technology in last year's *Reports* (Mead 1982).

3. For a more detailed examination of these aspects see the position papers in Lange (1980).

4. These different principles have repeatedly been discussed in the 1970s, for example, by Wilkins (1976), and in many Council of Europe papers, e.g., Trim (1980) and Trim *et al* (1980). A recent Council of Europe publication (1981) has reviewed the whole ten-year period, 1971-1981, of the Council of Europe approach to curriculum and has indicated the possible future developments of the Modern Languages Project of the Council of Europe.

5. For discussions on this frequently used concept see Müller (1980) and several articles in Alatis, Altman, and Alatis (1981). For a chronological account of recent trends of thought culminating in what is often now called "communicative language teaching" see, for example, Chapter 6 in Stern (1983).

6. See on this point the contributions by Stern and Swain in Alatis (1978), or Stern (1980a). A well documented recent monograph on immersion research with a detailed bibliography is a study by Swain and Lapkin (1982). Lafayette's recent research (1981) on content-based language teaching at the university level makes the same point (see Example 1, p. 21 below).

7. Trim (1980) displays and discusses various European schemes of levels and stages which should be considered besides the well-known FSI and DLI classifications. All these are mostly intended for adult learners, but they illustrate the principle. On the other hand, recent British experiments on so-called "graded examinations" illustrate stages of language learning at school level and are directly relevant to the present discussion (see Harding, Page and Rowell, 1980; and Buck[illegible] *al*, 1981).

8. See also Stern (1980, 1982).

9. For example, the Québec Ministry of Education (Ministère, etc. 1980, 1980a) has prepared a curriculum guide for ESL and FSL which is firmly based on a notional/functional presentation of content.

10. For a detailed discussion of "linguistic" vs. "communicative" competence see Canale and Swain (1980).

11. Allen's scheme is briefly discussed in my position paper (Stern 1980) and in Albert Valdman's (1980). The third level in Allen's scheme corresponds to the communicative syllabus in the Boston paper and the present article. It is a matter of classification whether the language syllabus be treated as two syllabuses (a structural and a rhetorical/functional one), as Allen does, or as one, as was done in the Boston paper. I favor treating it as one because the teaching approach is analytical for both. Allen's division has the advantage that it makes explicit the need for a *structural* as well as a *functional* component.

12. A detailed study of the integration of structural and functional components in course design has been made by Guntermann and Phillips (1981).

13. Besides the British example, several other schemes, briefly referred to above under "progression and stages", should be consulted. From the Council of Europe publications, the Threshold Level (e.g., van Ek, 1976 and Coste *et al*, 1976) and the subsequent publication of a *Waystage* (van Ek and Alexander, 1977) offer useful starting points. Similar efforts have also been made in Germany by groups of language teachers in the state of Hesse. In the United States Sparks in her reaction paper drew our attention to an example of the clear expression of language objectives by the California State Department (1980).

14. For a list of references, see Lafayette (1978). From its beginning in the fifties, the

Northeast Conference has regularly drawn attention to the cultural aspect of language teaching, e.g., Brée (1955), Bishop (1960), Dodge (1972), Born (1976) and several articles on contemporary cultures in last year's *Reports* (Mead 1982).

15. Rivers (1981: 337-8) summarizes different types of culture courses. Among the Boston position papers those by Lafayette and Strasheim (1980) and by Rivers (1980) are particularly relevant to this syllabus.

16. "For instance, the amount of bilingualism gained through a few weeks travel in Japan is fairly negligible . . . Yet the degree of biculturalism one might absorb during the same time may have very lasting consequences for the individual" (Jakobovits, 1970: 10).

17. The demand for a clearly defined area reference of sociocultural teaching is familiar to readers of the *Northeast Conference Reports* which have consistently advocated this policy for many years (e.g., Dodge 1972). Some reports have also called for an open recognition in foreign language curricula of ethnic groups in North America (e.g., Born 1976).

18. Pfister and Borzilleri (1977), and Levano and Pfister (1980).

19. For principles underlying these modules, see references in Note 1 above. For further details on ESL and FSL modules write to: Alice Weinrib, Librarian, Modern Language Centre, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6, Canada.

20. The principle of a communicative approach in the sense in which it is understood for the purpose of this syllabus is by now widely recognized. In 1977 the *Northeast Conference Reports* dealt with language for communication (Born 1977), and the 1978 *Reports* (Born 1978) which focused on authenticity as a criterion for new content came to grips with the same issue once more. In Britain, Dodson (1978) has for some years distinguished medium-oriented and message-oriented approaches to language teaching. Hawkins (1981) has written at length and very perceptively on the distinction between what he has called "immersion learning" and "foreign language learning". The present writer and his colleagues have repeatedly drawn attention to the distinction between formal and functional language learning (e.g., Stern *et al* 1976; Stern 1981, 1981a). Krashen's "acquisition" — "learning" distinction is concerned with the same issue (Krashen 1981a).

21. For a study on student exchanges from this perspective, see Hanna *et al* (1980). Student exchanges have also been discussed in recent *Northeast Conference Reports* within the context of new curricula, for example, in Born (1978) and by Travers in Geno (1981).

22. Further examples of teaching units which fall into this syllabus as well as into the linguistic and cultural one are discussed below in the section on integration. See pp. 133ff.

23. Several studies in the *Northeast Conference Reports* of 1981 (Geno, 1981) on global education and international studies as well as the position papers by Rivers (1980) and Lafayette and Strasheim (1980) in the ACTFL *Proceedings* (Lange 1980) are applicable in this context.

24. In the Northeast Conference survey which Peter Eddy undertook in 1980, such programs on the nature of language in general have also been noted (1980: pp. 44-5.).

25. Over a decade ago, Wilga Rivers (1971) proposed a two-stage approach to foreign language curricula, one an introductory stage, designed to arouse interest in language in general and interest in contact with a foreign country and its people, followed by a second stage, a course for those students who were eager to pursue more serious study of the language. Similar suggestions — a language sensitization program, replacing FLES, followed by the study of a foreign language at the high school level — were recently also made in Britain by Hawkins (1981). These and other proposals and experiments should be reconsidered in the present context. In particular, the suggestions of a recent study (September 1981), undertaken by FIPLV (Fédération internationale des professeurs de langues vivantes), on *multilingual education through compact courses* are of interest in this connection. (Freudenstein, in press.)

26. Lafayette (1978) explains in detail possible ways of integrating language (the linguistic

syllabus) and culture (the cultural syllabus), and provides a number of practical examples.

27. The interaction between subject matter and language use is fully discussed with reference to this module in an article by the two co-authors of the module, Allen and Howard (1981), with examples from the module in question.

Bibliography

Alatis, J.E. (ed.). *International Dimensions of Bilingual Education*. Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1978 (GURT). (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 1978).

———, Altman, H.B. and Alatis, P.M. (eds.). *The Second Language Classroom: Directions for the 1980s*. Essays in honour of Mary Finocchiaro. (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.)

Allen, J.P.B. "A Three-Level Curriculum Model for Second Language Education." Keynote address, Ontario Modern Language Teachers Association, Toronto, Ontario, 1980.

——— and Howard, J. "Subject-related ESL: An Experiment in Communicative Language Teaching." *Canadian Modern Language Review*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (March 1981): 535-550.

Bishop, G.R. Jr. (ed.). *Culture in Language Learning*. 1960 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1960).

Born, W.C. (ed.). *Goals Clarification, Curriculum, Teaching, Evaluation*. 1975 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1975).

——— (ed.). *Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons*. 1976 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1976).

——— (ed.). *Language: Acquisition, Application, Appreciation*. 1977 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1977).

——— (ed.). *New Contents, New Teachers, New Publics*. 1978 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1978).

Brée, G. (ed.). *Culture, Literature and Articulation*. 1955 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1955).

Brumfit, C.J. "From Defining to Designing: Communicative Specifications versus Communicative Methodology in Foreign Language Teaching," in Müller 1980: 1-9.

Buckby, M., Bull, P., Fletcher, R., Green, P., Page, B., and Roger, D. *Graded Objectives and Tests for Modern Languages: An Evaluation*. (London: Schools Council, 1981).

California State Department. *Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve*. (Sacramento, 1980).

Canale, M. and Swain, M. "Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Teaching and Testing." *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Spring 1980, 1-47.

Corder, S.P. *Introducing Applied Linguistics*. (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1973).

Coste, D. *et al.* Un niveau seuil. (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1976).

Council of Europe. *A European Unit Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults:* Ludwigshafen-am-Rhein, September 1977. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1979). (The introductory address by Trim provides the background to the Council of Europe language project.)

——— (ed.). *Modern Languages 1971-1981*. (Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe, 1981).

Dodge, J.W. (ed.). *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language-in-Culture*. 1972 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1972).

Dodson, C.J. *Bilingual Education in Wales.* (London: Schools Council, 1978).

Eddy, P.A. "Present Status of Foreign Language Teaching: A Northeast Conference Survey," in Geno 1980: 13-60.

Freudenstein, R. (ed.). *Multilingual Education Through Compact Courses.* (Munich: Hueber, and Oxford: Pergamon, in press).

Geno, T.H. (ed.). *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.* 1980 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1980).

——— (ed.). *Foreign Language and International Studies.* 1981 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1981).

Grittner, F.M. *Teaching Foreign Languages.* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969, Second edition, 1977).

Guntermann, G. and Phillips, J.K. "Communicative Course Design: Developing Functional Ability in All Four Skills." *Canadian Modern Language Review,* Vol. 37, No. 2 (January 1981): 329-343.

Hanna, G., Smith, A.H., McLean, L.D., Stern, H.H. *Contact and Communication: An Evaluation of Bilingual Student Exchange Programs.* (Toronto: OISE Press, 1980).

Harding, A., Page, B., and Rowell, S. *Graded Objectives in Modern Languages.* (London: CILT, 1980).

Hawkins, E. *Modern Languages in the Curriculum.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

Jakobovits, L.A. "The Psychological Bases of Second-Language Learning," mimeo (text of a lecture delivered at Indiana University, 1970).

Krashen, S.D. "Effective Second Language Acquisition: Insights from Research," in Alatis, Altman and Alatis 1981: 97-109.

——— *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning.* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1981a).

Krumm, H.J. "Communicative Processes in the Foreign Language Classroom: Preconditions and Strategies," in Müller (1980): 71-80.

Lafayette, R.C. *Teaching Culture: Strategies and Techniques.* (Language in Education series: Theory and Practice) (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1978).

——— "Toward an Articulated Curriculum," in Geno, 1980: 61-78.

——— "Approches formelles et approches non linguistiquement structurées pour l'enseignement du français langue seconde." 5th World Congress of FIPF, Rio de Janeiro, 1981.

——— and Strasheim, L.A. "Foreign Language Curricula and Materials for the Twenty-First Century," in Lange, 1980: 29-34.

Lange, D.L. (ed.). *Proceedings of the National Conference on Professional Priorities.* November 1980, Boston, Massachusetts, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (Hastings-on-Hudson, NY: ACTFL Materials Center, 1980).

Levano, A.W. and Pfister, G.G. "An Analysis of Surface Culture and its Manner of Presentation in First-Year College French Textbooks." *Foreign Language Annals* 13 (1980): 47-52.

Littlewood, W. *Communicative Language Teaching: An Introduction.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

Mead, R.G. Jr. (ed.). *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.* 1982 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1982).

Ministère de l'Education du Québec. *Programme d'étude primaire: Anglais langue seconde.* (Québec: MEQ, 1980).

——— *Programme d'étude primaire: Français langue seconde.* (Québec: MEQ, 1980a).

Moskowitz, G. *Caring and Sharing in the Foreign Language Class: A Sourcebook of Humanistic Techniques.* (Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers, 1978).

Müller, K.E. (ed.). *The Foreign Language Syllabus and Communicative Approaches to Teach-*

ing: Proceedings of a European-American Seminar. Special issue of *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Fall 1980).

Pfister, G.G. and Borzilleri, P.A. "Surface Cultural Concepts: A Design for the Evaluation of Cultural Material in Textbooks." *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 10(1977): 102-108.

Porcher, L., Huart, M. and Mariet, F. *Adaptation de "Un niveau-seuil" pour des contextes scolaires.* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1980).

Rivers, W.M. "The Language Learner: Reaching his Heart and Mind." *Canadian Modern Language Review, 28* (Oct. 1971), 1: 7-16).

——— "Practical Implications of New Trends and Directions," in Lange, 1980: 8-11.

——— *Teaching Foreign Language Skills.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, Second edition, 1981).

Stern, H.H. "Language Teaching Materials: The Next Phase," in Rondeau, G. (ed.). *Some Aspects of Canadian Applied Linguistics.* (Montréal: Centre Educatif et Culturel, 1973), 261-272.

——— "Mammoths or Modules." *Times Educational Supplement.* 8th October 1976 (special inset on modern language teaching, p. 44).

——— "Directions in Foreign Language Curriculum Development," in Lange, 1980: 12-17.

——— "Some Approaches to Communicative Language Teaching in Canada," in Müller 1980a: 57-63.

——— "Communicative Language Teaching and Learning: Towards a Synthesis," in Alatis, Altman and Alatis (ed.) 1981: 133-148.

——— "The Formal-Functional Distinction in Language Pedagogy: A Conceptual Clarification," in Savard, J.G. and Laforge, L. (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 5th Congress of the International Association of Applied Linguistics.* (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1981a), 425-455.

——— "French Core Programs Across Canada: How Can We Improve Them?" *Canadian Modern Language Review* 39/1, (1982), 34-37.

——— *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

———, Swain, M., McLean, L., Friedman, R.J., Harley, B., and Lapkin, S. *Three Approaches to Teaching French: Evaluation and Overview of Studies Related to the Federally-Funded Extensions of the Second Language Learning (French) Programs in the Carleton and Ottawa School Boards.* (Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1976).

———, Ullmann, R., Balchunas, M., Hanna, G., Schneidermann, E. and Argue, V. *Module Making: A Study in the Development and Evaluation of Learning Materials for French as a Second Language.* (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1980).

Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. *Evaluating Bilingual Education: A Canadian Case Study.* (Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters, 1982). First published in 1981 as *Bilingual Education: A Decade of Research.* (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education).

Trim, J.L.M. *Developing a Unit Credit Scheme of Adult Language Learning.* Prepared for the Council of Europe and published in 1978. (Oxford: Pergamon, 1980).

———, Richterich, R., van Ek, J.A., and Wilkins, D.A. *Systems Development in Adult Language Learning: A European Unit Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults.* First published by the Council of Europe, Strasbourg. (Oxford: Pergamon, 1980).

Tursi, J.A. (ed.). *Foreign Languages and the "New" Student.* 1970 Northeast Conference Reports. (New York: The Conference, 1970).

Ullmann, R. A Thematic and Activity Approach to Communicative Language Teaching in Second Language Classrooms. (Paper presented at the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics meeting, Ottawa, May 1981).

——— "A Broadened Curriculum Framework for Second Languages." *ELT Journal* 36:

255-62, 1982.
Valdman, A. "The Incorporation of the Notion of Communicative Competence in the Design of the Introductory Foreign Language Course Syllabus," in Lange, 1980: 18-23.
Valette, R.M. "Evaluation of Learning in a Second Language," in Bloom, B.S., Hastings, J.T. and Madaus, G.F. (eds.). *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning*. (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1971), 817-53.
van Ek, J.A. *The Threshold Level for Modern Language Learning in Schools*. (London: Longmans, 1976).
———, and Alexander, L.G. *Systems Development in Adult Language Learning: Waystage*. (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 1977).
Warriner-Burke, H.P. "Reactions: Curriculum and Materials," in Lange, 1980: 87-89.
Widdowson, H.G. *Teaching Language as Communication*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).
Wilkins, D.A. *Notional Syllabuses*. (London: Oxford University Press, 1976).
Zais, R.S. "Curriculum and Materials Development: A Jeremiad on the Past — A Standard for the Eighties," in Lange, 1980: 24-27.

Appendix

THE BOSTON PAPER*
on
CURRICULUM AND MATERIALS

The following recommendations are based on positions papers prepared by Robert Lafayette and Lorraine Strasheim (Indiana University), Wilga Rivers (Harvard University), H. H. Stern (The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education), Albert Valdman (Indiana University), and Robert Zais (Kent State University), on two reactor papers drafted by Carol Sparks (Mount Diablo Unified School District, CA) and Helen Warriner-Burke (Virginia Department of Education), and discussions in which participated the above named and Jane Bourque (Fairfield, CT) and John Darcey (West Hartford Public Schools, CT).

INTRODUCTION

In the next decade improvement in foreign language instruction can be expected to result, not from the emergence of wondrous pedagogical approaches or revolutionary breakthroughs in the disciplines that support foreign language instruction (linguistics, psychology, etc.), but by clearsighted formulation of learning objectives that respond to changing times and educational needs. These objectives, and the curriculum practices and materials designed to attain them, will necessarily vary according to specific local conditions: geographic area, language, age of learners, psychological and social characteristics of students, etc. The determination of objectives should be based on broad philosophical considerations and on the results of needs analysis and questionnaires.

A curriculum is/should be an integrated whole involving objectives, subject content, and methodological approaches. Curriculum design and the preparation of materials are not independent but interactive endeavors.

MULTI-DIMENSIONAL CURRICULUM

Current curricula and materials are largely based on a situational-structural syllabus guiding the selection and ordering of grammatical features and vocabulary. A more appropriate framework for curriculum design and materials preparation would be provided by recognizing

*Lange 1980:28.

four types of syllabuses: (1) linguistic, (2) cultural, (3) communicative, and (4) general language education.

Linguistic syllabus. At present the linguistic scope of materials is overambitious. The number of linguistic features presented needs to be reduced to manageable proportions in relation to the age and maturity of the students and the number of hours of study alloted to the course. The notion of what constitutes a linguistic feature also needs to be profoundly modified. In addition to the conventional phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical features syllabuses need to include features required for the organization of discourse (e.g., conversation openers and closes, hesitation features, fillers, etc.), as well as for speech acts. Emphasis should be placed on semantic distinctions crucial to the use of language for communcative purposes, rather than outward form. A clear differentiation needs to be made between linguistic features to be *recognized* by the learner and those over which s/he needs to acquire productive control. Instead of presenting items of a syllabus in linear fashion, one should introduce them in a cyclical or spiral fashion, a feature being presented first for recognition control, then on one or more successive passes for varying degrees of productive control. The selection and ordering of content items should be determined by characteristics of learners, as well as the career orientation of the course.

Cultural syllabus. Although the quality and scope of cultural materials found in present-day textbooks have improved significantly since the sixties, culture is still viewed as an add-on by the great majority of teachers and thus plays a minimal role in foreign language offerings. A primary need in designing the foreign language curriculum is that it include an explicit cultural syllabus, one that will give meaning to the learning of languages. The present curriculum is primarily form-oriented; in the future one must stress the learning of content as much as it does the learning of form. It is partly through an explicit cultural syllabus that foreign language learning will play an important role in a humanities-based education where students can acquire an in-depth understanding of the cultural values, attitudes and institutions of one or more foreign cultures, as well as a deeper understanding of their own values and those of minority groups in their own community.

Although research is needed to define an acceptable minimum for this explicit cultural syllabus, cultural knowledge should include material from a wide representation of communities speaking the particular target language, including minority groups in the U.S. One option would be to focus first on the culture of the country of origin of the language being learned (e.g., France in the case of the French language), extend consideration to other communities where the language is spoken (e.g., Quebec province), and, if applicable, complete the cycle with the study of ethnic groups speaking the language in the United States (e.g., Southwestern Louisiana).

The presence of an explicit cultural syllabus also implies that the scope and sequence of the foreign language curriculum not be based solely on linguistic features. At times cultural elements will be grafted on the language to be taught while at other times, language elements will be grafted on basic cultural concepts. Finally, an explicit cultural syllabus mandates that its content be tested as seriously and as formally as the established linguistic syllabus.

Communicative syllabus. In order to achieve some degree of communicative ability foreign language students need to engage in the use of language in a near-natural context in addition to practice in the identification and production of linguistic elements (even when these have been redefined more broadly). When students are engaging in communicative activities, focus should be on effective transmission of meaning and efficient performance of communicative tasks. It is important that errors of form be tolerated when students engage in communicative activities, with correction or essential reteaching being kept for more formal language-learning sessions. Input, both oral and written, should always consist of authentic language which would be encountered by a native speaker, although careful selection will ensure that it is not

beyond the student's grasp at a particular point in their linguistic development.

While they should be encouraged in the foreign language classroom, simulation and role-playing can lead only to a limited degree of communicative ability. For students to achieve in-depth proficiency in the communicative use of a foreign language they should be provided with opportunities to (a) acquire subject content by means of the foreign language (immersion approach, for example) or (b) interact in natural situations with speakers of the foreign language. The latter may be attained by:

i. encouraging exchange home-stay programs at all levels (teacher-teacher, student-student);
ii. generalizing study abroad programs (short-term to neighboring countries where full-term programs are not feasible);
iii. promoting service work in the foreign language or second language community. (particularly, in U.S. minority language communities);
iv. organizing language camps, festivals, and visits to minority language communities.

Such experiences should always incorporate individual projects which provide motivation for students to interact with native speakers on a basis more extensive and continuous that the usual superficial social exchanges.

General language education syllabus. In addition to leading to the acquisition of skill in the use of a foreign language and to knowledge of the culture of the target language communities a foreign language curriculum should serve to expand students' knowledge and understanding of the relationship between language and a variety of areas: language and meaning, language and culture, language and societal structure, language and thought, language and the development of personality, language in manipulation, persuasion, and prejudice. The study of a foreign language should impart an understanding of the nature of language and should form more enlightened attitudes about cultural differences. These broader educational objectives are in line with current thought about global education. Such objectives may be achieved within the format of conventional foreign language courses but also be exploratory language courses (especially at the middle school level) and by the study of Latin or Greek. To contribute significantly to general education, foreign language courses should include:

- learning how to learn a language
- learning about language variation and about language varieties and levels of language use
- the comparative study of cultures

PRIORITIES

(1) Research-based formulation of detailed course objectives that respond to changing times and eductional needs.
(2) The definition of acceptable minimums in the four syllabuses that will comprise the foreign language curriculum in order to establish a core for a basic language course and effect more efficient articulation from level to level.
(3) The development of a broader-based linguistic syllabus to include speech acts and discourse features in addition to the conventional phonological, morphosyntactic, and lexical features.
(4) The development of a broadly based explicit cultural syllabus.
(5) The development of experiential communicative activities that enable the learner to go beyond the defined linguistic and cultural syllabuses.
(6) The development of a general language education component that permits students to transfer specific learnings to learning about the nature of language, culture and communication.
(7) The identification of viable optional curricula for use especially in early language learning and in adult and continuing education.

Jane McFarland Bourque
Mount Vernon, N.Y., Public Schools

Thirty Years of the Northeast Conference: A Personal Perspective

This year the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages is celebrating its thirtieth anniversary. The Chairman invited Jane Bourque to share her perspective of these thirty years. Jane has been a strong supporter of the Northeast Conference for many years; she has been a presenter many times; she served on the Board of Directors and was elected Chairman of the 1977 Conference. Jane has also been active with the AATF and is past-President of ACTFL. Her active involvement in and intimate knowledge of the Northeast Conference make her an ideal person to review the development of the Conference since its inception in 1954.

Introduction

Just as each human being is made up of three unique but interdependent parts — body, mind, and soul — so also is this extraordinary professional phenomenon we call the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. On the surface, the assignment of analyzing thirty years of *Northeast Conference Reports* seemed a fairly simple one, especially since those years coincided almost exactly with the author's own personal commitment to foreign language teaching. However, careful reexamination of Report after Report, totaling about four thousand pages, revealed the complexity of the task.

How does one condense and organize what has gone into those three decades of contributions by the best leaders and the finest minds, as well as the most outstanding teachers, skillful editors, talented writers, dedicated board members, gifted speakers, energetic workshop coordinators, respected theorists and consultants from inside and outside the profession, and all those whose names may not have appeared in print and thus may not have received credit, but who nevertheless contributed immensely to the refining of the *Reports*? What seemed to be called for was not an analysis of the content, but rather a synthesis of the impact. Let all those who can do so go back and read for themselves the valuable and enlightening content of the thirty *Reports*. In the meantime, we would like to picture the Northeast Conference as a total entity with, like each of us, a body, a mind, and a soul.

Corpus

The "body structure" of the Northeast Conference is the annual meeting itself, held each spring in one of our larger cities, over a period of four days, and attended by several thousand foreign language professionals. An outgrowth of the Yale-Barnard Conference on the Teaching of French, the first meeting of the Northeast Conference was held in 1954 in Providence, Rhode Island, at the invitation of Brown University and Pembroke College. An impressive crowd of eight hundred gathered at that first meeting.

In subsequent early years, different universities served as hosts, but as attendance increased steadily, the Conference site shifted to large hotels. It became evident that huge areas were needed for exhibits, general sessions, forums, film showings, numerous workshops, banquets, board meetings, receptions, etc., to say nothing of lodging for participants. Although there has been some concern about the cost (one should keep in mind the cost in time and money to the colleagues who volunteer to put the Conference together), most participants enjoy the hotel atmosphere and facilities. They add elegance and cohesion to the occasion; there is a sense of "getting away" from the workaday world, although certainly not from work; there are many pleasant opportunities and locales to meet with colleagues informally over meals; and there is a chance to rub elbows or chat with respected leaders at various all-day or all-evening activites. To some, this may seem mundane, but professional growth does not preclude personal satisfaction. After all, we certainly recognize the value of motivation — for the teacher, as well as for the student.

Significant changes have taken place over the years in the format of the Conference, the most strikingly noticeable one being the gradual shift from open forums for discussing the working papers to a multitude of workshops dealing primarily with topics suggested by the papers. The original forums tended to be less productive than the new format, sometimes being simply a rehash of what had been written — and presumably read — and an opportunity for individuals to take turns at a floor microphone to agree or disagree or to ask questions and offer suggestions. Many of the ideas expressed were excellent, but some were just complaints about the difficulties and deficiencies in particular educational systems.

Since the advent of the workshop format, the Conference has become even more interesting, valuable, and practical to those it attracts. Not only can participants truly participate now, they can take back to their schools many helpful handouts, of immediate use either directly or by adaptation to their needs, and they can order tape recordings of sessions which they regretted missing or which they wish to share with their departments.

There are still forums for very specific purposes, and the largest of these is the General Session, where excellent speakers, sometimes celebrities, are invited to speak on subjects of interest and importance to all. Awards are also presented at the General Session: the annual Stephen A. Freeman Award for a published article on teaching techniques, the Foreign Language Advocate Award, the Northeast Conference Award for Distinguished Service and Leadership in the Profession given in memory of Nelson H. Brooks, and the Northeast Conference Journalism Award for the best reporting, analysis, or commentary in daily newspapers on foreign language educa-

tion for Americans. These awards are described more fully in the newsletters that registrants receive in February and September. Occasionally, award winners are invited to make a major presentation, and these speeches are then printed in the Reports of the following year.

The "heart" of the Northeast Conference is its yearly publication: the *Northeast Conference Reports*, originally published as the *Reports of the Working Committees*. The title was changed in 1979, as more and more of the writing was assigned to individual authors rather than to committees headed by a chairman. The change was necessitated also by a long-overdue recognition of certain realities: some committee members contribute much more than others; the writing styles of individual committee members often do not blend, presenting a problem for the editor; some issues are so controversial that members of the Board of Directors cannot agree among themselves or with the authors on their "publishability"; and, finally, some authors strongly object to any modification whatsoever of their writing style or the ideas they wish to express.

These realities surfaced so early in the history of the Conference that the editor of the *Reports* in 1956, the third year, found it necessary to include a disclaimer in her preface: "The opinions expressed and the conclusions drawn in the Reports here presented are in every case those of this year's committees. In a few instances they are at variance with the opinions and conclusions of previous committees, and with the consensus of opinion of the present Executive Committee of the Conference." Given the extreme controversies on issues that emerged in the 1960s and 1970s, it is surprising that the working committee format lasted as long as it did.

Currently, the "title" which appears on the cover of the *Reports* is the theme chosen for the Conference by the Chairman. There is much that goes unrecognized in this situation also. First, most Conference participants are unaware that a Chairman is elected two years in advance of a Conference to the office of Vice Chairman, and that his or her work begins immediately. It takes almost two years to prepare a Conference. Immediately after election of a Chairman, a theme must be identified, along with a rationale for choosing this theme. Then sub-topics, which will emerge in the form of individual Reports, must also be outlined. These must all be approved by the Board of Directors. After approval of the theme and sub-topics, writers are sought and, upon their acceptance, are immediately given a schedule of deadlines to meet. Until 1979, they were usually urged to select a committee as rapidly as possible, and either meet or make assignments. Recently, the authors have been free to write the entire Report themselves or to select collaborators.

The Conference Chairman not only selects writers; he or she also selects an invaluable assistant: the Editor. From this point on, they work together to guide and assist the authors and, of course, ensure that they meet their deadlines. This would appear to be an easy task; it is not. Often authors diverge alarmingly from the theme, or they may digress to the point that they go far beyond the Editor's guidelines on the depth or scope. Or they may fall short, even to the point of having to relinquish their assignment occasionally, for health reasons, close to deadline for manuscript. If this happens, other experts who are both gifted and reliable and can write spontaneously on the subject must be found. It has even happened that the Conference Chairman, a Consultant, and the Editor teamed up to write the Report themselves. The Board of

Directors is kept advised and is asked to contribute its suggestions, but all of this must take place by September before the April Conference. By November, the final copy must go to the printer in order for publication and mailing to preregistrants about one month prior to the Conference.

In the meantime, the Board of Directors has turned its attention to what will take place at that (current) Conference in April. The Conference Chairman must direct all of this activity, too, and has an important voice in decisions made. However, the key person in the mammoth job of preparing the Conference is the Secretary-Treasurer. He helps the Chairman and the Board to make decisions in the light of economic reality. His work literally never stops, and he is continually under more pressure than anyone else connected with the Conference, especially throughout the four days of the Conference itself, right up until the last person leaves.

The first mention of a Secretary or a Treasurer was in 1963, although some dedicated individuals certainly performed these tasks from the beginning. In 1965 the Board realized that it needed a Recording Secretary (for the meetings) *and* a Secretary-Treasurer (much more than the title implies). The latter negotiates for the Board and acts as its business manager for the Conference. With the assistance of a staff of two employees, he directs the secretariat, presently in Middlebury, Vermont. He maintains a computerized mailing list of seventeen thousand individuals, larger than the membership lists of any other organization in the field.

Two appointed officers of the Board who are highly important to the Directors and to the Secretary-Treasurer in his coordination of the Conference program are the Local Committee Co-Chairmen. The first of these was recognized in 1963. Now the task requires two people because of the amount of work and because of the number of local colleagues to be enlisted to volunteer their services in turn.

Only elected officers and directors as members of the Board of Directors can make policy decisions about the Northeast Conference. The directors are elected by the Advisory Council, made up of representatives of institutional members which support the Conference. The Advisory Council meets once a year. The Conference is not an individual membership organization. Institutional members send representatives to the Advisory Council meeting in the belief that their sponsorship is worthwhile, in terms of improved teacher expertise and morale. Hopefully, teachers report back to their president or superintendent about the value of the Conference they have attended each year.

The Board selects workshop leaders, speakers, award recipients, and consultants; it reacts to the Reports; and it approves the format of each annual meeting. Individual Board members also serve on committees, take on special tasks, present workshops, evaluate films, and write sections or articles for the Newsletter, the Program, or the *Reports*.

Finally, a word should be said about "appendages" to the Northeast Conference, even though most of them have been alluded to already. 1976 was a year which introduced three innovations: the Modern Language Film Festival, the Career Counseling Service for teachers, and the Award for Excellence in Language Study for students nominated by their teachers. All of these were welcomed with enthusiasm. The Newsletter was started in 1977 with a single issue, but, since 1978, has appeared twice a year. In 1982, the Amicitia Linguarum Award for "friends of foreign language"

from outside the profession was created.

Exhibit space rental has always provided essential financial support for the Conference, as well as attracting many teachers who come with the express purpose of examining the latest materials in their subject area. It is not uncommon for teachers to purchase materials for their classes with money out of their own pockets, and they sign up for sample texts to be sent to their schools. Advertising first appeared in the *Reports* in 1965, not to disappear again until 1980, perhaps because it now appears more profitably in the Newsletter and the Program, and because the *Reports* have more than doubled in length in their thirty-year history.

Mens

Having examined external, physical aspects of the Northeast Conference, the way it is structured and how it operates, let us turn to the intellectual aspects. What are they? What has been the purpose of the development of a beautiful structure and the mental effort put in to give it life? It certainly has not been just an excuse to meet once a year and enjoy ourselves in the name of professional growth, although our professional growth in the past fifty years might call for a celebration of sorts, a kind of "moveable feast." At times we doubted it. The question of whether we could call ourselves more than amateurs was raised in the 1971 *Reports* by the Committee on Professional Responsibilities and brought up again, rather controversially, in 1980.

Webster defines a *profession* as "a calling requiring specialized knowledge and often long and intensive preparation including instruction in skills and methods as well as in the scientific, historical, or scholarly principles underlying them, maintaining by force of organization or concerted opinion high standards of achievement and conduct, and committing its members to continued study and to a kind of work which has for its prime purpose the rendering of a public service." None of us would have any argument with that definition, but the reader may wish to look up the 1971 Committee's definition of a "model profession" and its opinions on how we measure up. (See pages 26-29 of the 1971 *Reports*).

The issue of professionalism, although never brought up in quite the same way in any of the other *Reports*, lies behind much of the writing, especially when committees are dealing with teacher education, inservice training and retraining, certification, testing, standards of achievement, public relations, and organizational activities. We have approached all topics in a professional way.

We did not always — we do not yet — have a "concerted opinion," which is healthy. The debate itself shows that we are alive and conscientious. One of the earliest issues to stir controversy was that of audiolingualism. The word "audiolingual" was coined by a member of a Working Committee and first appeared in the *Reports* of 1959, but the groundwork for it had already been laid in the first *Reports* of 1954, when references were made to an "aural-oral approach." It was actually half of a longer adjective: audio-lingual-visual-graphic, referring to what we often call "the four skills" (listening-speaking-reading-writing).

However, "audiolingualism" became a catchword, a slogan, a dogma, a stigma, a method, an approach, a threat, and finally a still-respected technique or set of

techniques that we have available to us. The reason that this "innocent" term sparked such a fierce methodological battle is that it symbolized a quarrel over basic beliefs: i.e., structural linguistics vs. transformational linguistics. We can thank audiolingualism for bringing to our attention again what many modern language teachers have believed since 1945, that one of our top priorities is to include the listening and the speaking skills in our teaching. Now, in the 1980s, we refer to "proficiency" or to "communicative competence." The greater issue today is how to teach it.

Let us not forget the progress the profession has made since the 1920s, when the Reading Method (Direct Translation) was dominant, and when leaders of our profession said everywhere that a student could never learn to understand and speak a foreign language in a classroom. Middlebury College, with its famous language schools, was a revolutionary upstart. The Northeast Conference provided the forum in the 1950s and 1960s for these opposing beliefs to be argued out; its influence was considerable. What progress our profession has made! And it is continuing to make progress. And the Northeast Conference is continuing to provide the forum.

Another recurring issue throughout the *Reports* is how to teach culture. A minor controversy arose over this concern also, mostly of a semantic nature. In fact, in the 1970s we seemed to be playing word games. Much attention was given to defining and distinguishing "culture" and "civilization," but the struggle was won with less professional bloodshed. We went on to examine with care "exploratory language," "individualized instruction," "goals clarification," and "global education," the last of which is a current concept under scrutiny. Understanding of and familiarity with the culture of the peoples whose languages we speak has also been a basic goal in our classrooms since the mid-40s. The trouble was, and is, that too few foreign language teachers have this familiarity themselves and have difficulty teaching it. The pressure is now on the teacher, and progress is being made.

The proportion of language teachers who have lived and studied abroad, and who return frequently to renew themselves, is still too small. Only a few years ago one might have predicted that as many as 75% of the estimated 85,000 language teachers in the United States fell into this category, but tremendous progress is being made, and foreign study is now "the way to go." The Northeast Conference and other language study leaders are stressing the matter, and the profession insists on it.

All issues and topics are recurrent. How can it be otherwise? They are more or less permanent, but the "personnel" change, so the issues must be regularly restated. Another is teacher education and certification. These concerns, along with the qualifications of language teachers, as alluded to above, were topics addressed in the first two *Reports*, in 1954 and 1955. Even in the 1961 *Reports*, at a time when language enrollments were rising instead of falling, as they did in the 70s, and there was a shortage of teachers, one finds the same basic concerns about teacher preparation, competence, and certification requirements that one finds in the 1978 *Reports* on "New Teachers." The profession was much concerned with defining its standards.

Curriculum has to be mentioned as another of the ongoing issues in the *Northeast Conference Reports*. In the 1980 *Reports*, an author zeroed in on the absolute necessity of an "articulated curriculum." We have given more than lip service for years to the importance of good articulation in order to achieve our goals and see our students progress systematically, but the essential element of articulation — coordination — is

still being defeated by budget cutting and lack of administrative support. Articulation has been more than a serious concern; it has been a real problem between FLES and the middle schools, between the middle schools and the high schools, and between the high schools and college.

Two events, neither of which was the result of our own professional efforts per se, had tremendous impact on foreign language teaching during the time period covered by the *Northeast Conference Reports*, 1954 to 1983. They were: first, the launching of the first Sputnik by the Soviets in 1957; and second, twenty years later, the creation of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies in our own country in 1977. For an excellent chronicle of the political, professional, and public activities surrounding the latter, see the 1981 *Reports*, at the end of which also appears "Reactions of the Northeast Conference to the Recommendations of the President's Commission," as published in the 1979 Final Report to the President: *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*.

Both of these events affected the foreign language teaching profession and put demands on it that it was barely prepared to meet. Both were favorable to it, beneficial to it; both were welcomed, but many teachers, and even leaders, did not realize that we were to squirm in the national spotlight suddenly thrown on us, in both cases bright enough to reveal the validity of our claims and needs, but also the undeniability of our weaknesses. We still face many challenges in the areas of public image and accountability.

Another challenge thrust upon us has come from rapid technological advances. This is an area in which there has been a lot of forward movement, but not much continuity, and certainly not enough accord. With the government funding that followed Sputnik, NDEA institutes and language laboratories swept the country. The institutes retrained many thousands of American teachers, first in this country, then through study abroad. The laboratories were installed in many schools, paid for by grants, maintained for a while, but soon became an object of controversy, because they were often misused by apprehensive, untrained teachers (who had not been able to attend the institutes) and abused by bored, improperly supervised students. This happened on the secondary school level; fortunately, many colleges and universities and some schools were able to make excellent use of their language laboratories and still do.

At this writing, teaching by computer, especially for individualized or self-instruction, is being suggested to us. Yet money is needed for effective programming. By the time the money is found and the teachers are properly trained, to say nothing of being given the time to plan and prepare materials, will technology have brought us another challenge? The answer is probably yes, but we must not give in to frustration and defeatism. We must continue to seek solutions. A major role of the Northeast Conference is to keep teachers informed of progress and new opportunities. Its workshops, such as those on computer technology and language teaching, help train the teachers.

Alma et Anima

Going beyond the role it plays in our professional lives, let us now consider what we might call the "soul" and the "spirit" of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. The small gold arrow, created and first presented in 1977, and representative of the arrow symbol which has appeared on the covers of all but two Reports since 1954 (the cover design changed in 1980 and now shows a larger, silhouetted arrow), is truly a symbol of the Northeast's ambitious purpose, as expressed in the Preface of the 1977 *Reports*: "to treat language as a whole: its nature, its history, its relationship to culture, the acquisition of it, the immediate uses to which it can be put, and the development in our students of an appreciation for the gift of tongues."

So many professionals have come together at the Conference throughout the years to bring forth and disseminate the best ideas, the best theories, the best techniques, and then go home and apply these in the classroom. Our goal has been to educate Americans to speak other languages and understand other cultures, and to encourage Americans who already speak other languages not to lose them and the cultural heritages which go along with them — so that the United States itself might not remain linguistically or culturally isolated.

The author has deliberately refrained from mentioning the name of any one person throughout this Report, even those that, in her humble opinion, deserve to be mentioned. One reason for this is that if some leaders are cited, others will unavoidably, and regrettably, be slighted. A second reason is that it would be undignified to single out individuals and diminish the intent of this Report by disputing or comparing qualifications for due credit. (Thomas à Kempis admonished us not to compare saints!) A third reason is that so very many of our colleagues in these past thirty years have given so much to the Conference and to the writing and refining of its *Reports*. Repeating the recommendation made at the beginning, we urge readers to go back and read for themselves those valuable *Reports*, form their own opinions, and gain their own personal perspective. A final reason is that we, as professionals and humans, should remember that our names may be forgotten, but the work we have done is carried on by others, and that it is what matters.

If there is a "raison d'être" for the Northeast Conference, it has to be in the influence it has had on the foreign language teaching profession. The Conference has inspired the creation of other fine regional conferences and assisted them financially. It has given them moral support in their endeavors and invited their leaders to participate in its own sessions, especially those on leadership and unity in the profession. It is now cooperating actively with national language organizations. It recently became a member of the Joint National Committee for Languages and has offered to match, during this first year, any money contributed to the JNCL by other regional conferences, to encourage them to become members also.

The Northeast continues each year to attract the largest number of professionals to its own Conference. It has retained its well-earned respect and dignity. It has been honest and self-examining, inviting criticism and suggestions without flinching or excusing itself. It has honored our leaders and shown its appreciation for their loyalty. It has expanded the geographical scope of the Conference, not only through the other regionals, but by including among its presenters, authors, and Board members,

representatives of states farther to the west and south, in what might be called the "greater Northeast" quadrant of the nation.

The influence of the Northeast Conference extends, of course, all across the United States and even abroad through its publications. The *Reports* are subscribed to by many libraries and are widely used as reference material. Teachers, especially those who cannot attend the Conference, often refer to the articles in the *Reports*. Researchers find them useful. In general, the influence of the *Reports* is far wider than the meetings. Then there are the Northeast's other publications, those geared to practical use by teachers — foreign language and otherwise — such as the booklets on public relations and on supporting legislative action. English is considered the "lingua franca" of all the Northeast's publications, although in the *Reports* of 1982, some were written in the foreign language, according to the topic.

To illustrate further the ever-increasing influence of the Northeast, one might mention the Winter Workshops, started in 1981. The third one was held this year in Providence, site of the first Northeast Conference. Another innovation will be the Literary Symposia, planned for the current 1983 Conference in Baltimore. It is evident that the Northeast Conference is alive and alert and enjoys a continuing impact on the profession.

The Northeast Conference's "soul" pursues the ideal of creating generations of Americans who are proud of their own country, language, and culture, but who recognize the value of understanding other languages and other cultures. We want our students to feel challenged, but not threatened, by the different attitudes they encounter in the world. We want them to feel enriched, but not embarrassed, by their efforts to speak a foreign tongue. By gaining respect for other peoples, our students will gain in self-respect. A foreign language class is one of the best places for our youth to acquire the skills and confidence which make possible this approach to life in today's world.

The "spirit" of the Northeast Conference, symbolized by the arrow, and animated by our collective effort, strives ever upward toward the ideal of true professionalism. We hold tenaciously to high standards for ourselves and for our students. We examine continuously new methods, materials, and guidelines. When we seem to be failing, we fight harder to win. Like shepherds, we go out to bring lost sheep into the fold, urging our colleagues to join us, debate with us, inspire us, but never give in to defeatism. Ralph Waldo Emerson told us that "nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm."

From Anatole France we heard that "to know is nothing at all; to imagine is everything." The Northeast Conference always dreams "the impossible dream." Tell its followers that they can never teach students to communicate in a foreign language; they will try to prove in every way possible how it can be done. Tell them that valid, effective tests can never be devised; they will sit at their curriculum tables until late into the night designing, coordinating, evaluating, and writing. Tell them that it is impossible to teach culture; they will fire up their students to follow them abroad. Tell them, in a final attempt at rejection, that Americans and their lawmakers will never want to understand how important language study is; they may march to Washington.

For thirty years, the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages has never given up. It has only grown stronger, with more and more followers, more believers. How could it ever give up? As each "impossible dream" becomes a reality, the Northeast's soul and spirit find another dream to dream. And so it goes on.

1982 RECIPIENTS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN LANGUAGE STUDY

Many secondary schools offer achievement awards to their outstanding students, and the Board of Directors of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages feels that more language students should be among those recognized. The following list represents the Awards for Excellence in Language Study presented in 1982. Any school wishing to recognize student achievement by awarding a Board of Directors Award for Excellence in Language Study should contact the Northeast Conference Awards Committee, Box 623, Middlebury, VT 05753, and request a nomination form.

ALASKA

Palmer: Palmer HS. Suzanne Stehlik (F).

ARIZONA

Forrest City: Forrest City HS. Amy Bynum (F, S).
Ft Smith: Northside HS. Ann Pham (S), Derek Chapman (F).
Jonesboro: Jonesboro HS. Nancy Gandy (F).

CALIFORNIA

Anderson: Anderson Union HS. Cindy Urban (F).
Burlingame: Mercy HS. Haydee Alfonso (S, F).
Downey: Warren HS. Sean Walsh (S).
Dublin: Dublin HS. Laura Erle (F).
Fresno: Central Union HS. Kelly Michel (G).
Lancaster: Antelope Valley College. Tina Butler (F).
Los Angeles: Loyola HS. Christopher Robert (S), Steven Blaha (F), Ron Duran (G), Christopher Barrios (L); **Brentwood School:** Robert West (G).
Monterey: Monterey Institute of Int'l Studies. Aziz Zellou (E), James O'Grady (S), Rima Omais (F), Peter Kalfas (R), Robert Yamaguchi (J).
Oroville: Oroville HS. Vallie T. Remmerde (F).
San Rafael: San Rafael HS. Andrew Weinstein (F).

COLORADO

Colorado Springs: Gen William Mitchell HS. Kristin Rockwell (G), Lauri Strauss (F), Dwayne Cunningham (L), Rhonda Jackson (S).
Denver: Thomas Jefferson HS. James Morgan (L), Barbara Smetana (F), Cathy Weber (S).
Englewood: St Mary's Academy. Mary Able (L).

CONNECTICUT

Cheshire: Cheshire HS. Marilyn Zagres (L), Sarah Marx (S), Kelly McReavey (G), Martha Miller (F).
Colchester: Bacon Academy. Sharon Stepule (S).
Darien: Darien HS. Mary Holland (G), Teresa Eckrich (F), Herrick Wales (L), Brooke Van Norstrand (S).
East Hartford: Robert J. O'Brien Middle School. Joyce Patrocinio (S), Barry Powlishen (F); **George J. Penney HS.** Esther Routhier (F), Victoria Veltri (S).
Greenwich: Saint Mary HS. Matthew Maddox (F), Melissa Balint (S).
Guilford: Guilford HS. Robert Johnson (L), Michelle Sordi (S), Christa Nordlund (F), Laingdon Schmitt (G).
Meriden: Francis Maloney HS. Karen Lu (F), Ann McCarthy (S), Marty Tiezzi (I); **Orville Platt HS.** Silvana Papaluca (I), Jill Oefinger (F).
New Canaan: New Canaan HS. Ian Stone (F), Arianne van der Meulen (G), Karen Croft (S), Karen Bloomquist (L).
New Fairfield: New Fairfield HS. Sheryl Edgerly (F), Jennifer Southard (S).
North Haven: North Haven HS. Giovanna Pigrucci (F), Charles McPhedran (S).
Norwalk: Brien McMahon HS. Anne Dennehy (F), Linda Fakundiny (G), Giovanna Surace (I), Ramona Addesso (L), Patti Drasky (S).
Norwalk: Norwalk HS. Cimberli Carpenter (F), Jennifer Levy (G), Ornella Mazzei (I), Georgia Schaffner (L), Deborah Ornstein (S).
Old Saybrook: Old Saybrook Sr HS. Karen Kozma (F), Sandra Yannone (S), Laurette Cousineau (L); **Old Saybrook Jr HS.** Craig Wilson (F), Ann Bakewell (S); **Main St School.** Yolanda Carter (S).
Ridgefield: Ridgefield HS. Diane Zandri (I), Sue Dieterich (F), Ann Phillips (G).
South Windsor: South Windsor HS. Loriann DePasquale (S), Jennifer Neil (L), Kenneth Iczkowski (F).
Stamford: Sacred Heart Academy. Lisa Iantorno (S).
Stratford: Bunnell HS. Melissa Bradley (G), Elizabeth Cook (L), Michele Royal (S); **Stratford HS.** Anne-Marie Mizera (G), Joanna Mastrodimos (L), Donna Bobko (S).
Waterbury: Notre Dame Academy. Susan Sargeant (F); **Holy Cross HS.** Laura Croke (F, L).
West Hartford: Sedgwick Middle School. Elizabeth Joslin (F), Ben Aller (S); **Conard HS.** Michael Mancini (I), Heidi Jamieson (G, S), Anthony Wang (L), Nancy Pascoe (F).
West Hartford: Hall HS. Andrew Fleischman (G), Jonathan Goldberg (I), Adam Epstein (F, L), Scott Parven (R), Hugh Schweitzer (S); **King Philip Middle School.** Lynn Goldfarb (S), Karen Humphrey (F).
West Haven: Notre Dame HS. Robert Jackson (F).
W Redding: Joel Barlow HS. Kristen Froelich (F).
Wilton: Wilton HS. Jennifer Brenner (G), Eric Liebler (R), Mary Kravec (S), Lisa Cooper (F).
Windsor: Loomis Chaffee School. Sue Webber (R, S), Jennifer Mayer (G).
Woodbridge: Amity Reg Sr HS. Sylvia Yu (F), Andrea Ambrose (S, G), Frank Trombetta (L).

DELAWARE

Claymont: E. Lee Stein, Jr (G), Kathleen Gallagher (S), Mary-Ellen Leigh (F), Karen Stumpo (I).
Dover: Holy Cross HS. Stephania Daliani (F).
Frankford: Indian River HS. Mary Schroeder (F).
Wilmington: Padua Academy. Edith Gottemoller (L), Jodi Roberts (F), Joan Szatkowski (S), Charlene Bozzo (I).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington: Academy of Notre Dame. Carol Hill (S), Katherine David (F); **St Patrick's Academy.** Lawanda Brown (S); **Capitol Hill Montessori School.** Allen Ewald (S); **Theo Roosevelt Senior HS.** Denise Estes (S); **St Anselm's Abbey School.** Guillaume Hensel (G).

FLORIDA

Boca Raton: St Andrew's School. Stephen Aucamp (S).
Jacksonville: Bartram School. Sara Gettamy (L), Fiona Zayonc (S).
Miami: Miami Christian College. Adam Zaslavsky (G) - Greek, Grace Sasscer (H) - Hebrew.
North Miami Beach: No Miami Beach Sr HS. Dawn Chin-Quee (S) (F).
St Petersburg: St Petersburg HS. Chris Routh (F).

GEORGIA

Dacula: Dacula HS. Mary Chastain (S).

HAWAII

Honolulu: Damien Memorial HS. Mark Won (F), Terence Corpus (G), Paolo Samonte (S).

IDAHO

Rupert: Minico Senior HS. Irene Zamora (S).

ILLINOIS

Chicago: Marie Skledowska Curie HS. April Rivera (F); **St Patrick HS.** Anthony Bongiorno (S).
Dolton: Thornridge HS. Jacqueline Pconka (S, G).
Evanston: Evanston Township HS. Sarah Breen (L), Katherine Penick (G), Jeffrey Edwards (F), Nancy Draznin (H), Lisa Kirschenbaum (S).
Herscher: Herscher HS. Jerry Prodoehl (L), Maureen Schott (F), Denise Krygowski (S).

Kankakee: Bishop McNamara HS. Angelica Rickter (S).
Libertyville: Libertyville HS. Linda Moncys (S), Pamela Wagner (F), Brian Allen (G), James Naureckas (L).
Mendota: Mendota HS. Yolanda Espinoza (S).
Moline: Moline Sr HS. Richard Zimmer (L); **Calvin Coolidge Jr HS.** Colleen O'Connor (L).
Ottawa: Marquette HS. Sara Machiorletti (S), Anthony Magana (F).
Springfield: Springfield HS. Kathryn Garland (F).
Wheaton: Wheaton Central HS. Dawn Westlake (S).

INDIANA
Evansville: Mater Dei HS. Patrick Wildemann (G), Linda Winterman (S).
Fort Wayne: Northwood Middle School. Kim Wilson (F).
Greenfield: Greenfield Central HS. Michelle Mercer (G), Cheryl Allford (S), Peggy Berg (F).
Mishawaka: Penn HS. Matthew Martin (F), Chad Berry (S).
South Bend: James Whitcomb Riley HS. Scott Dunham (L), Mark Vakkur (G), Elizabeth Carrico (S).

IOWA
Center Point: Center Point Consolidated. Joe Romine (S).
Council Bluffs: Lewis Central HS. Angie Heitman (S), Doug Kurth (F).
Knoxville: Nell McGowen Jr HS. Valerie Holst (S).
Martensdale: Martensdale - St Mary's. Kimberly Leonard (S).
Mason City: Mason City HS. Sheila Smed (S).
West Union: North HS. Kayleen Roys (G).

KANSAS
Wichita: Wichita Collegiate School. Tiffany Scholle (S), Edison Wong (G).

KENTUCKY
Harrodsburg: Mercer County HS. Tammy Baker (S).
Independence: Simon Kenton HS. Catherine Bullard (F).
Louisville: DeSales HS. Jerome Fowler (G).
McKee: Jackson County HS. Betty Sizemore (S).
Wingo: Wingo HS. Larry Bruce (F).

LOUISIANA
Vinton: Vinton HS. Leslie Breaux (F).

MAINE
Boothbay Harbor: Boothbay Reg HS. Stacey Miller (F).
Eliot: Marshwood HS. John Belliveau (F).
Kennebunk: Kennebunk HS. Julia Sharood (S), Foxwell Emmons (F, L).
Portland: Univ of Southern Maine. Douglas Hubley (G).
Westbrook: Westbrook HS. Susan Colby, (F).
York: York HS. Wendy Cornell (F).

MARYLAND
Adelphi: Regina HS. Beth LaBuda (L), Lisa Henley (S).
Annapolis: Annapolis Sr HS. Ines Pinto (S), Michele Pethel (F).
Baltimore: Archbishop Keough HS. Dianne Michael (S), Kathy Lackey (G), Judith Siegert (F), Indira Gurubhagavatula (L); **Baltimore School for the Arts.** Reginald Love (F); **Roland Park Country School.** Lind Shin (S), Susan Whiting (F); **Roland Park Country Middle School.** Kimberly Theis (S), Katie O'Donovan (F); **Parkville Sr HS.** Tammy Hett (F, S); **Overlea Senior HS.** James Tarr (F, S); **Towson State Univ.** Leland Knight (S).
Bel Air: Harford Day School. Pamela Smith (F).
Damascus: Damascus HS. Paula Wilkinson (F), Caroline Menzel (G), Karan Weaver (S).
Ellicott City: Mt Hebron HS. Mary Eastland (S), Tereza Uzunoglu (F).
Frederick: Hood College. Debbie Dalton (F), Rosemarie Hanson (G).
Germantown: Seneca Valley HS. Virginie Harris (F, S), Sheryl Burnett (G), Brigit Shea (L).
Glen Burnie: Old Mill Senior High. Diane Buck (B), Laura Kelly (F).
Hagerstown: North Hagerstown HS. Cynthia Clopper (F).
South Hagerstown HS: Sandra Wilson (F), Paula Post (G).
Mardela Springs: Mardela HS. Lori Fox (S).
McDonogh: McDonogh School. Stephen Maitzen (F), David Daneman (S), Frederick Schlimm (G).
Parkton: Hereford Jr-Sr HS. Tiffany Norris (S), Catherine Dordai (F).
Riverdale: Parkdale HS. Ann Michels (G), Dody Anderson (F), Sandra Barrett (S).
Rockville: Robert E. Peary HS. Sharon Eimer (L), Sheri Nimetz (S), Sandy Waynberg (F); **Richard Montgomery HS.** Karyn Lubore (S), Rachel Sengers (F).
Salisbury: James Bennett Sr HS. Ellyn Hogg (S), Julia Payne (F), Martha Senkbeil (L).
Silver Spring: Northwood HS. Ruth Felsen (F), Dawn Eddy (G), Charles Abrams (S).
Sykesville: South Carroll HS. Danette Anderson (G), Donna Baker (S).
Towson: Towson Sr HS. Susan Haage (S), Martha Sipe (F); **Notre Dame Prep School.** Suzette Guay (F), Dagmar Henderson (S).
Upper Marlboro: Queen Anne School. Miyako Newell (S), Rachel Wolford (F).

MASSACHUSETTS
Belmont: Belmont HS. Barbara Staufer (G), Leon Bruneau (S), Jennifer Lampl (F), Joann Galvin (I), Elaine Snyder (L).
Beverly: No Shore Comm College. Doris Lemelin (S, F).
Boston: Boston English HS. Mojan Taheri (F).
Bridgewater: Bridgewater-Raynham Reg HS. Albert Beninati (F), Jill Colford (L).
Byfield: Triton Regional School. Tanya Vlahos (F, G).
Chicopee: Chicopee Comp HS. Ann Fowler (L), Darlene Jubinville (G).
Deerfield: Eaglebrook School. Andre Kikoski (F), James Young (S).
Dorchester: Boston College HS. Dariusz Swienc (G), Paul Vail (S), Richard Cotell (F).
Groton: Groton-Dunstable Reg HS. Faye Staples (L), Pam Orazio (F, S).
Haverhill: Haverhill HS. Matthew Moylan (I), Eric Hannenian (G), John Stevens (L), Patricia Boksanski (F).
Hingham: Hingham HS. Elizabeth Harrington (G), Andrew Labonte (L), Marilu Stuart (F), April Hutchinson (S).
Hyannis: Barnstable HS. Sean Smith (S), Jennifer Ellis (F).
Ipswich: Ipswich HS. Kelly Fitzpatrick (S).
Lawrence: Lawrence HS. Lisa Frizzell (F), Deborah Parolisi (L, I), William Coutris (S).
Lee: Lee HS. Pam Williams (F).
Littleton: Littleton HS. Jennifer Cohen (F).
Lowell: Univ of Lowell. Ruth La Bay (F).
Lynnfield: Lynnfield HS. Kathleen Kelly (S).
Mattapoisett: Old Rochester Reg HS. Alieta Rothwell (F), Benjamen Sawyer (L).
Milton: Milton HS. Leslie McLellan (F), Amy Katzoff (S).
Natick: Walnut Hill School. Anna Pearlman (F).
Needham: Needham HS. Edward Lundgren (G), Stephen Barr (S), John Scigliano (F), Jean Rainville (L).
New Bedford: New Bedford HS. Maria Duarte (Portuguese), Ana Rodrigues (S), Sherrill St Germain (F), Fernanda Carapinha (L); **Roosevelt JHS.** Helena Carreiro (F), Geraldine Wilde (Portuguese); **Keith JHS.** Maria Sousa (F), Maria Martins (Portuguese).
North Dartmouth: Southern Mass Univ. Ana Ferreira (F).
North Eastham: Nauset Regional HS. Elizabeth Aiken (S).
Quincy: Quincy HS. Janet Volpe (S); **Eastern Nazarene College.** Giulio Binaghi (S), Carol Yansick (G).
Stoneham: Stoneham HS. Elizabeth Neiterman (S, F, L, R).
Sudbury: Lincoln-Sudbury Reg HS. Jennifer Crawford (S), Christine Fryer (G), Lauren Oasis (F).
Townsend: No Middlesex Regional HS. Becca Day (S), Sandy Greene (G), Carolyn Starrett (F).
Wakefield: Wakefield Mem HS. Paul Giblin (S), Heidi Cresta (I), Stephen DeVita (L), Heather Brown (F).
Wellesley: Wellesley College. Debra Smith (S); **Wellesley Sr HS.** Nancy Ross (F), Diane Smith (S).
West Springfield: West Springfield Sr HS. Jennifer Rogalski (F), Victor Bienick (L), Ginalda Zarlengo (I), Kenneth White (S).
Winchester: McCall Jr HS. Melissa Grigorieff (F), Amy Craig (S); **Winchester HS.** Christopher Ceruoio (L), AnnaMaria Formichella (I), George Smith (G), Bruce Nichols (F), Suzanne Virnelli (S).
Wrentham: King Philip Reg HS. Jill Podell (S), Betsy Konowitz (F).

MICHIGAN
Detroit: Cass Tech HS. Brian Corr (L), Samuel Johnson (F).
Hamtramck: St Ladislaus HS. Mary Ann Zaleski (P), Nancy

Busch (S).
Millington: Millington HS, James Cichoracki (F).
Mt Pleasant: Central Michigan Univ, Renee Cunnings (G), Jann Wolf (S), Nancy Jatkowski (F).
Okemos: Okemos HS, Laura Zarobinski (F), David Petersen (G), Nina Kallen (S).
Sault Ste Marie: Sault Ste Marie Area HS, Saundra Kiczenski (F).
South Lyon: South Lyon HS, Cheryl Gaughan (G).
Utica: Utica HS, Rhonda Eschenburg (F).

MINNESOTA
Pine River: Pine River HS, Kim Davis (G).
Sebeka: Sebeka HS, Vincent Kempf (G).

MISSISSIPPI
Hattiesburg: Oak Grove HS, Penny Nowell (F).
Pascagoula: Pascagoula HS, Tommy Lockard (L), Kathy Davies (S), Mark Dennis (G), Pamela Mandrell (F).

MISSOURI
Desloge: North County HS, Tim Engler (F), Mila Masulit (S).
Hillsboro: Hillsboro HS, Sharon Gonzalez (S).
Independence: Van Horn HS, Vincent Edd (G).
Jefferson City: Helias HS, Maria Groner (S), Wendy Fluegel (F).
Overland: Ritenour HS, Steven Allen (G), Terri Crump (S).
St Louis: St Louis University HS, Robert Schukai (S), Jeffrey Mathews (F), Jim Rickenbaugh (C), Paul Joern (R).

NORTH CAROLINA
Barco: Currituck Cnty HS, Susan Maxwell (F), Darryl Patterson (S).
Enka: Enka HS, Kim Dills (S).
Fayetteville: Douglas Byrd Sr HS, DeJoyce Palms (S), Debora Engelbrecht (F), An Yoon (G).
Oxford: J.F. Webb Senior HS, Kimberly Greene (F).
Raleigh: Leroy Martin JHS, Suzy Hassan (L), Walter McNairy (G), Rachel Parr (S), Leslie Hoag (F).

NEBRASKA
Omaha: Millard South HS, Julie Nelson (F).

NEW HAMPSHIRE
Dover: Dover HS, Alison Rakoske (F).
Hanover: Hanover HS, Mary Daschbach (G, F).
Hollis: Hollis HS, Annette Dubois (S), Anne Monius (F).
Nashua: Bishop Guertin HS, Kevin Capone (S).

NEW JERSEY
Bayonne: Bayonne HS, Maria Bellomo (I).
Bayville: Central Reg HS, Marie Poltronieri (S), Carlos Hanze (F).
Berkeley Heights: Governor Livingston Reg HS, John Bouffard (S), Carolyn Knapp (F).
Bernardsville: Gill/St Bernard's School, Celeste Como (F).
Bloomfield: Bloomfield Sr HS, Deborah Ruskowsky (S).
Bound Brook: Bound Brook HS, Karl Troeller (L, S).
Butler: Butler HS, Kenneth Klemm (S), Lorie Gawreluk (F).
Caldwell: Caldwell College, Nilda Santos (S).
Carney's Point: Penns Grove High School, Dean Sparks (S).
Chatham Boro: Chatham Boro HS, Sabine Matsushita (G), Amy Harrison (F), Mark Lee (S).
Cherry Hill: Cherry Hill West HS, Sue Boehm (F), Lisa Kmiec (S); **Camden Catholic HS**, Rita Murrell (F), Isabel Prendergast (G).
Chester: West Morris Central HS, Diane Galion (F), James Riordan (G), Patricia Juliano (I), Jane Baldwin (L), Karen Ram (S).
Cinnaminson: Cinnaminson Middle School, Joseph Palladino (S), Liza Herschel (F); **Cinnaminson HS**, Karen Kriss (F), Denise Peirce (G), Sharon Dusheck (S).
Clark: Arthur L. Johnson Reg HS, Vito Gagliardi (I), Kathleen Macaluso (S), Michelle Bellinger (G).
Demarest: Northern Valley Reg HS, Annette Weller (F), Daniel Niniuaggi (S), Mary Roncati (I).
Denville: Morris Catholic HS, Susan Yadlon (F), Ramona Stoecker (G), Raymond Reed (S); **Morris Knolls HS**, Cheryl Fulton (F), Jennifer Larkin (S), Anamaria Henschke (G).
East Brunswick: East Brunswick HS, Paula Hsu (G), Isabelle Sirolle (F), David Sleppin (S), Maureen Meehan (L).
East Orange: C.J. Scott HS, Warren Bevan (S).
Edison: Edison Township HS, Frances Ishii (S), Brian Azzarello (F).
John P. Stevens HS: Lorraine Norian (F).
Englewood: Dwight-Englewood School, Sarah Krakoff (F), Lesley Allen (L).
Fair Lawn: Fair Lawn HS, Beth Godt (H), Sharon Lubowicz (I), Marcia Spieler (S), Catherine Gandet (F), Beth Benjamin (L), Barbara Szczepek (G).
Farmingdale: Howell HS, Stephen Cavazzoni (R), Joyce Pernice (L).
Freehold: Freehold Township HS, Robin Levy (S), Tina Apellaniz (L), Lisa Schmitt (G), Karen Kniesler (F).
Glen Rock: Glen Rock Jr-Sr HS, Kathleen Mangini (L).
Hackensack: Hackensack HS, Douglas Campbell (S), Arlene Renshaw (F), Josephine Riotto (I).
Hammonton: St Joseph HS, Charles Lentine (S), Wendy Wright (F).
Hightstown: Hightstown HS, Pamela Pierce (F, I, S); **The Peddie School**, William Bunting III (L), Diane Makarewicz (G), Gwendolyn Tan (F), N. Andrew Lederman (S).
Hillsdale: Pascack Valley HS, Cheryl Wagner (F, G), (S).
Holmdel: St. John Vianney HS, Myriam Breton (F), Michael McFadden (G), Roseanne Finn (S); **Holmdel HS**, Armelle Elmoznino (S), John Leahy (F), Richard Chollick (G).
Iselin: J.F. Kennedy Mem. HS, Patti Schaefer (S), Richard Hill (G), Karen Kube (F).
Kinnelon: Kinnelon HS, Juliette Walker (S), Steven Rucker (F), Carol Nykamp (G).
Lakehurst: Manchester TWP HS, Sean Grant (F), Donna Muliero (S).
Lanoka Harbor: Lacey Township Middle School, Ralph DeSimone (F, S).
Lawrenceville: Rider College, Karen Butterfield (G), Olga Bosques (S), Joan Golding (F); **Notre Dame HS**, Anna Bevilacqua (G), Patrice Gardner (F), Kathy Rostock (L).
Linden: McManus Jr HS, Jacqueline Burns (S), Andrew Pekosz (G), Susan Pass (F); **Linden HS**, Cynthia Weber (G), Katrina Watkins (S), Kathy Lucey (I); **Soehl Jr HS**, Laura Seebergh (S), Michael Martin (G), Jill Seebergh (F).
Livingston: Livingston HS, David Robinson (F), Jane Gollob (S).
Lodi: Lodi HS, John Izzo (F).
Lyndhurst: Lyndhurst HS, Anthony Greco (S), Mary Kloss (I), David Sayers (G), Salwa Seleh (F).
Maplewood: Columbia HS, David Eber (F), Drue Hawrylak (G), Anthony Coppola (I), Deborah Limmer (S), Kim Partoll (L), Jerome Glasser (C).
Metuchen: Metuchen HS, Elise Kravet (F), Melissa Reinner (S).
Midland Park: Midland Park HS, Tara Grady (F).
Millburn: Millburn Sr HS, Margaret Wildrick (F), Michael Witsenhausen (G), Joseph Marley (L), Philip Birnbaum (S).
Montclair: Immaculate Conception HS, Patricia Cassidy (S); **Montclair HS**, Christienne Genaro (F), Cynthia Baumann (G), Debbie DiPietro (I), Ellen Mudryk (S).
Montvale: Pascack Hills HS, Mary Meek (S, F, G).
Morristown: Frelinghuysen Jr School, John Lynch (F), Christine Drake (S).
New Brunswick: New Brunswick HS, Rebecca Rodriguez (S), Frank Hopps (G), Jalil Mloukhiyeh (F), Otto Valdez (E).
New Milford: New Milford HS, Lisa Kilarjian (F), Doris Ecaterinis (S).
Newton: Kittatinny Reg. HS, Richard Anderson (F).
North Arlington: Queen of Peace HS, Janine Pietrucha (F), Kathleen Wright (S), Kenneth Monaco (I).
North Brunswick: North Brunswick Township HS, Tina Torres (S, F).
No. Caldwell: West Essex Regional HS, Susan Neufang (G), William Ruvo (I), Mary Martinez (L), Alan Crosta (S), Jilline Ringle (F).
Nutley: Nutley HS, Julie Van Steen (F), Audrey Kaplonski (G), Anna Manetta (I), Sharon Schmidt (L), Pauline Alama (S).
Oradell: Bergen Catholic HS, Robert Piaskon (F), Paul Conciatori (I), Thomas Meloro, Jr. (S); **River Dell Sr HS**, Mona Czuch (F).
Palisades Park: Palisades Park Jr-Sr HS, Marisa Mesropian (F), Nancy Vitetta (I).
Paramus: Paramus HS, Linda Vigilant (S), Deidre Stein (F), Karen DePalma (I), Amy Podmaversky (G), Jacob Murad (Hebrew), Amy Benjamin (L).

Park Ridge: Park Ridge HS. Celia Mistretta (F), Theresa Chow (G), Donna Golden (S).
Parsippany: Parsippany Hills HS. Wendy Kornreich (S), Mark Biskowitz (F), Christine Geis (I), Walter Schonfeld (G), Joanne Cavanaugh (L).
Plainfield: Plainfield HS. Kilma Lopez (S), Elisha Hope (F).
Pompton Plains: Pequannock Township HS. Kevin Klecha (S), Deborah Liston (F), Andrew Cohen (G).
Princeton: St. Joseph's Prep. Seminary. Harry Arnone (S); **Princeton Day School.** Robert Wisnovsky (L), (Greek), (F).
Princeton Jct: West Windsor-Plainsboro HS. Amanda Marks (F), Mary Haws (S).
Riverside: Riverside HS; Adriene Jenik (F), Wendy Macolly (S).
Rockaway: Morris Hills HS. Seth Geldzahler (F), Victoria Colaneri (S).
Rumson: Rumson-Fair Haven Reg HS. Stephanie Haas (F), Marie Tzannetakis (S).
Scotch Plains: Union Catholic HS. Valerie Moore (S).
Somerset: Franklin HS. Venitta Barnett (F), Robert Kopchains (S), Claude Griffin (Kiswahili), Robert McArdle (L); **Sampson G Smith Intermediate.** Elizabeth Pigniczky (G), Kim Schultheiss (S), Carrie Camastra (F); **Rutgers Prep School.** Edward Schultheiss (S), Claudia Chae (F).
South Amboy: St. Mary's HS. Beverly Godleski (F).
South Orange: Marylawn of the Oranges. Elizabeth Huber (F), Eileen Dougherty (L).
Spotswood: Spotswood HS. Juliet Neaves (S).
Springfield: Jonathan Dayton Reg HS. Jack Levitt (S), Michael Schweizer (G).
Summit: Oratory Prep. Augustus Elmer (S); **Summit HS.** Jeffrey Plaut (S), Sandra Gisoldi (I), Reto Meier (G), Anne Grimes (L), Alice Zimmerman (F); **Summit JHS.** Laura Placke (F), Tanya Ferencko (G, L), Ilario Finis (I), Rich DeReyna (S).
Teaneck: Teaneck HS. Kimberly Cyr (F, R).
Tenafly: Tenafly Middle School. Michael Stoler (F), Kandy Chuh (G), Iun Young Lee (S); **Tenafly HS.** Eric Pomert (F), John Fetter (R), Melissa Lantz (L), Stephen Heller (S).
Tinton Falls: Monmouth Regional HS. Michelle Levesque (F), Mary Abbiati (L), Glenn Campbell (G), Michael Broyles (S).
Toms River: St Joseph HS. Lisa Fontenelli (F).
Trenton: Trenton State College. Margaret Schuss (S), Susan Natale (F), Elke Hierl (G); **Hamilton HS West.** Tina Dutko (G), Linda Lettich (S), Maria Tegzes (F); **McCorristin HS.** Marielena Bresnen (G), Philippe Delorme (F), Cynthia Revesz (S); **Ewing HS.** Rachel Halpern (F), Marie Walsh (S).
Union City: Holy Rosary Academy. Nelayda Fonte (F), Mary DeBellis (S), Phyllis Manente (I); **Union Hill HS.** Patrizia Aquino (I).
Vineland: Sacred Heart HS. Carol Pierotti (F), Robert Ternay (G), Robert Currie (S); **Vineland HS - South.** David Beaudoin (F), Margie Tieslau (G), Daniel Lalli (Greek), Monica Ippolito (I), Robin Barbetti (L), Daisy Padilla (S).
Waldwick: Waldwick HS. Wendy Waters (S), Andrea Zivari (F, G).
Wayne: De Paul HS. Robert McDevitt (S).
West New York: Memorial HS. Lisette Penate (F); **St. Joseph's of the Palisades HS.** Dianaa Fernandez (S), Beatriz Nogueira (F).
West Orange: West Orange HS. Sonia Vargas (S), George Matts (F); **Mountain HS.** Mark Jessen (S), Laurie Kopp (F), Robert Sarnowski (I).
Woodbury: Woodbury HS. Heather Long (F, S).
Wood-Ridge: Wood-Ridge HS. Katherine Majdanski (F).

NEW YORK

Brooklyn: FD Roosevelt HS. Sonia Lopez (S), Dmitry Fomin (English); **William Alexander Jr HS.** Belinda Passataro (S), Spyros Panos (F); **JHS 303.** Lillian Perez (S); **Summit Jr HS.** Sheila Reaves (S); **Satellite West Jr HS.** Angelica Serrano (S); **McKinny JHS 265.** Barbara Rodriguez (S).
Cheektowaga: Maryvale Sr HS. Melody Masternak (S), Anna Babbi (F).
Conklin: Susquehanna Valley HS. Aileen Corkery (S), Patricia Hardwick (F).
Delhi: Delaware Acad and Central School. Jennifer Hinrichs (G).
Dix-Hills: Half Hollow Hills HS East. Barbara Weisfeld (S), Kathleen Galvin (F), Carmela Sbarro (I).
Downsville: Downsville Central School. Christopher Mahon (F), David Terry (S).
East Amherst: Casey Middle School. Annette Vertino (S), Craig Schorr (F).
Elmont: Elmont Memorial HS. Lisa Brochmann (F), Laura Cusumano (I), Maria Holden (S).
Flushing: John Bowne HS. Sandra Albuja (S), Shelly Chin (F), Antonia Assalone (I).
Forestville: Forestville Central School. Cheryl Franklin (S).
Franklin Square: H Frank Carey HS. Peter McKeon (S), Rosalba Davi (I); **Valley Stream North HS.** Deborah Postelnek (F).
Garden City Park: Mineola HS. David Schnabel (F).
Henrietta: James E Sperry HS. Linda Sesnie (S), Shelly Thornberg (F); **Carlton Webster Jr HS.** George Hayakawa (S), Karen Segar (F).
Henrietta: Charles H Roth HS. Douglas VanLare (G), Jennifer Heister (F).
West Henrietta: Burger Jr HS. Andrea Del Gaudio (F), Yvonne Murphy (S).
Hicksville: Hicksville HS. Andrea Mola (S), William Eberle (L), Christine Ciasiko (I); **Hicksville Jr HS.** Ronald Fleming (F), Teresa Leahy (I), James Simon (S).
Hopewell Junction: John Jay HS. Kristen Bagnell (S).
Jamaica: The Mary Louis Academy. Alma Ortiz (S), Maria Prieto (F), Maria Saraceno (I), Elizabeth Comerford (L).
Kings Park: William Rogers JHS. Jeffrey Farkas (S), Monica Fuertes (F).
Kingston: Kingston HS. Linda VanDuyne (F), Beatrice Ehrsam (G), Joseph Hill (S).
Lancaster: Lancaster HS. Laura Simon (G).
Mexico: Mexico HS. John Donegan (G).
Millbrook: Millbrook School. Alan Walker (L, F).
Mount Vernon: Mount Vernon HS. Graciela Alcabin (S).
New Rochelle: The Ursuline School. Diana Ferrucci (S), Allison Coppola (F); **New Rochelle HS.** Adam Kent (L), Naomi Grabel (S), Thomas Reichert (R), Joshua Prince (I), Neil Bermel (F).
New York: The Calhoun School. Monica Feinberg (F); **The Bronx HS of Science.** Robert Garabo (S); **Xavier HS.** Horacio Galeano (S), Robert Genco (I), Thomas Devecchis (R), Gilbert Krauland (G), Norman Lee (Greek) (L), Arthur Fuscaldo (F).
Norwood: Norwood-Norfolk Central School. Kelly Huiatt (L), Karen Lustyik (F).
Old Westbury: The Wheatley School. Sharon Lee (F), Corey Klestadt (I).
Orangeburg: Tappan Zee HS. Christina Ksoll (G), Gail Horton (S), Nancy Boris (F).
Orchard Park: Orchard Park Middle School. Lisa Miller (S), Allison Galbraith (F).
Pelham: Pelham Mem HS. Daniel Sessa (S), Anne Buffa (I), Constance Tritsch (F).
Penfield: Penfield Sr HS. Kathy Dinan (S), Paul Coleman (G), Carl Muench (L), Martin Lynch (F).
Pleasantville: Pleasantville HS. Eleanora Gonzalez (S).
Ridgewood: Grover Cleveland HS. Donna Burtnett (I), Valerie Pagoto (F), Nancy Reves (S).
Rochester: Brighton HS. Leonard Petrix (G), Lina Klimas (R), Dan Rosen (F), Mary-Claire Roghmann (S), Glenn Weiner (L); **Nazareth Academy.** Anita Perez (S), Mary Kelly (L, F), Cheryl Shank (I).
Rockaway Park: Rockaway Beach JHS. Paul Donas (S).
Rockville Centre: South Side Sr HS. Andrew Greenberg (S), Barbara Pollack (F).
Roslyn Heights: Roslyn HS. Rhoda Alani (F), Deborah Kotick (S).
Schaghticoke: Hoosic Valley HS. Patti Brennan (F, S).
Schenectady: Niskayuna HS. James White (S), Joseph Bell (G), Emily Mathews (F), Gail Weiss (L); **Mt. Pleasant HS.** Kimberley Berning (F).
Seneca Falls: Mynderse Academy. David Ludd (F), Robin Ritter (S).
Shoreham: Shoreham - Wading River HS. Steven Losquadro (S).
Silver Creek: Silver Creek Central School. Robert Newcomb (F).
Snyder: The Park School of Buffalo. Jonathan Mosovich (S); **Amherst Central Sr HS.** Jennifer Irwin (S), Steven Ellis (L), Amy Brook (F), Paul Greizerstein (G).

Southold: Southold HS, Donna Hoffner (F), Ed Williams (S).
Staten Island: GL Egbert Jr HS #2, Vasiliki Perdios (I), Richard Keller (S), Sam Cohen (F); **St. John Villa Academy**, Cindy Cama (S), Joanne Lobaito (I).
Syosset: Our Lady of Mercy Academy, Filomena D'Onofrio (F), Jeanna Cicorelli (S).
Uniondale: Uniondale HS, Linda Cossen (I), Ana Garcia (E, English), Robert Brust (G), Susan Darmethoski (F), Lisa Milano (S).
Valhalla: Westchester Comm. College, Kitty Barry (F).
Valley Stream: Central HS, Anita Gruenthaler (G), Salvatore Evola (I), Erik Goluboff (F), Rosanna Salomone (S).
Watervliet: Watervliet HS, Denise Bagarose (R), Michael Gorman (S), Nancy DiNino (F), Kristin Paulsson (G).
West Nyack: Clarkstown HS South, Vicki Kokkalenios (L), Nicole Capece (F), Susan Bobroff (H), Andrea Colandrea (I), Frances Soliveres (S), Janet Ostertag (G).
Williamsville: Williamsville South HS, Katherine Davis (S).
Wolcott: North Rose - Wolcott HS, Susan Johnson (F).
Wyandanch: Wyandanch Memorial HS, Corey Hardeman (S), Louise Ward (F).
Yonkers: Saunders Trade & Technical HS, Adriana Talero (S).

OHIO

Bellaire: Bellaire HS, Christine Klaas (F, S).
Beverly: Fort Frye HS, Debbie Zimmer (S).
Chardon: Notre Dame Academy, Monica Krepfl (G), Karen Krizner (S), Jennifer Russell (F).
Cincinnati: Univ of Cincinnati, Mark Kuhlmann (G).
Cleveland: St. Ignatius HS, Stephen Palmer (F).
Cleveland Heights: Beaumont School For Girls, Kathy Stitts (S), Sheila Tambe (F), Niriam Hill (L).
Columbus: Columbus Alternative HS, Mark Hovey (F).
Dalton: Dalton HS, Shari Kornhaus (S).
Dayton: Stebbins HS, Brian Brinkman (S).
Greensburg: Green HS, Brian Jarrell (S).
Kettering: Fairmont West HS, Scott Greenwood (L), Anne Moseneder (F).
Martins Ferry: Martins Ferry HS, Sandy Dinardo (F).
McDonald: McDonald HS, Katica Markulin (S).
Milford: Milford HS, Shelley Kirschner (L).
Mt Vernon: Mt Vernon Nazarene Coll, Pamela Hall (S).
Thompson: Ledgemont HS, Beverly Wrightsman (F).
Toledo: St John's HS, Thomas Povsic (G); **Central Catholic HS**, Michael Kaseman (G), Virginia Stein (S), Theresa Hadeed (F); **Whitmer HS**, Alison Zeiger (S), Michelle Tanguay (F).
Trenton: Edgewood HS, Robert Garrison (S).
Wapakoneta: Blume Jr HS, David Roberts (L), Beth Becher (S).

OKLAHOMA

Enid: Chisholm HS, Sherri Hess (F).
Noble: Noble Jr HS, Tim York (S); **Noble HS**, Shari McMahan (S), Jacqueline Stone (F).
Norman: West Mid HS, Seth Bumgarner (F), Kelly Hall (S), Priti Srivastava (L).
Pauls Valley: Pauls Valley HS, Charles Howard (S).

OREGON

Lake Oswego: Lakeridge HS, Andrew Emlen (S).
Ontario: Ontario HS, Tammy Hodges (S).

PENNSYLVANIA

Abington: Abington HS, Michelle Braccia (I), Mark Watts (L), Ellen Greenstein (S), Olga Malis (G).
Aliquippa: Hopewell Sr HS, Brian Grantz (F), Judy Inman (G), John Prasko (L).
Allentown: Harrison Morton Jr HS, Charles Lapp (S); **Allentown Central Cath HS**, Joann Muthard (S), Anna Brown (F), Danielle Heiser (G).
Alverton: Southmoreland Sr HS, Teresa Dreliszak (S).
Ambler: Wissahickon HS, Ellen Oerter (L), Lisa Shillady (S), Luan Nguyen (E), Jeanne Schmid (F).
Bethlehem: Liberty HS, Karyn Ryan (F), Andrea Wuerth (G), Susan Chlebove (L), Vance Morrison (S), David Cimera (R).
Blairsville: Blairsville Sr HS, Dan Woodring (S).
Commodore: Purchase Line HS, Kristi Jones (S).
Coraopolis: Moon Sr HS, Maria Stilwell (I), Edward Walker (S), Dave Johnson (G), Rachel Lorey (F).
Downingtown: Downingtown HS, Jim Jer-Don (S), Jeanne Hessinger (G), Matty Woodruff (F).
Drexel Hill: Monsignor Bonner HS, Richard Buoni (S), Daniel Reardon (F); **Archbishop Prendergast HS**, Elizabeth Manion (S).
Erie: Mercyhurst Prep School, Susan Balogh (F), Christine Cacchione (S).
Exeter: Wyoming Area Sr HS, Rhea Rutstein (G), Raymond Skursky (F), Eileen Cawley (S).
Fairless Hills: Pennsbury HS, Donna Carroll (F), Miriam Maxian (G), Michele Whitecraft (S).
Flourtown: Mt St Joseph Academy, Mary McGann (S), Anne Titterton (F).
Hazelton: Hazelton Sr HS, Eileen Walsh (F), Harold Aurand (G), Mary DeNoia (I), Kathleen Dougherty (S).
Jefferson: Jefferson-Morgan Jr-Sr HS, John Addis (S).
Jenkintown: Jenkintown HS, Kathy MacArthur (S), Suzanne Hummel (F).
Lancaster: Conestoga Valley HS, Michael Peachey (S); **Lancaster Catholic HS**, Mark Keating (G).
Latrobe: Greater Latrobe Sr HS, Denise Bronson (F), Joseph Hinger (S), Judy Konjoly (G).
Meadville: Allegheny College, Carol Campbell (G), Carolyn Gregord (S).
Merion: Merion Mercy Academy, Margaret Finegan (F), Noelle Ruane (S).
Monroeville: Gateway HS, David Speck (S), Mike Murphy (G).
Newtown Square: Marple Newtown Sr HS, Kimberly Dengler (), Laura Powell (S), Mary Morris (G).
Newville: Big Spring HS, Judy Day (S), Marianne Bonnie (F).
Philadelphia: Girard College, Robert Trotter (F), Antonio James (S); **St Joseph's Univ**, Regina Stango (I), Christine Sweeney (G), Mary Blue (S), Catherine Houston (F); St Joseph's Preparatory School, James Campanile (S), John Burke (G), Peter Mattei (F); **Northeast HS**, Sheryl Aisenstein (S); Olney HS, Roosevelt Powell (S), Angel Nieves (SP), Maria Caruso (F); **Washington HS**, Stacy Kaplan (H), Christian Kulczytzky (G), Lorraine Scheffer (L), Ming Lo (F), Ludmyla Jewtushenko (S); **Franklin Learning Center**, Lee Newberg (F).
Pittsburgh: Swissvale HS — Woodland Hills, Kristin Brandt (F); **Sacred Heart HS**, Elizabeth Regan (L).
Reading: Albright College, Lisa Murphy (G), Joan Hillegass (F), Paul Jones (S).
Scranton: North Scranton Intermediate School, Donna Shaw (F).
Stoneboro: Lakeview Area HS, Karen Horstman (L), Scott Preisel (S), Dotty Beckman (F).
Swiftwater: Pocono Mountain Middle School, Kelly Burns (F), Karlyn Bendixen (G), Deborah Jones (S).
Tamaqua: Marian HS, Bernard Matscavage (S), Karen Horan (F).
Tyrone: Tyrone Area HS, Lisa Rodkey (S), Donna Quigley (F), Stephen Everhart (L).
Uniontown: Lafayette Jr HS, Rose Grimplin (S).
Upper St Clair: Upper St Clair HS, Tim Connors (F), Eva Klain (G), Carla Valvo (S).
Warminster: Archbishop Wood HS For Girls, Dianne Jones (S), Rasa Kailis (G).
Waynesboro: Waynesboro Area Sr HS, Lori Sachs (F), Kathleen McKula (L), Melanie Kline (S).
West Chester: Henderson HS, Deborah Martin (G), Steven Campanella (I), Patricia Townsend (F), Craig Grear (L), Kimberly Clark (S); **East HS**, Laura Wolfe (F).
Wilkes-Barre: Elmer Meyers HS, William Sergi (F).
Wyncote: Cheltenham HS, Cutler Blayne (F), David Freedman (S).

RHODE ISLAND

Barrington: Barrington HS, Elizabeth Hurley (F), Kimberly Corson (L), Eric Westerlund (G), Elizabeth Racette (S).
Cranston: Cranston HS East, Pamela Galt (L), Debra Faiola (I).
Cumberland: Cumberland HS, Karen Thompson (F), Nancy Kelly (S).
Esmond: Smithfield HS, David McSweeney (F).
Kingston: Univ of Rhode Island, Maria Leva (I).
Newport: Salve Regina College, Linda Bouley (S).
North Smithfield: No Smithfield Jr-Sr HS, Steven Leduc (F).
Pawtucket: Tolman Sr HS, Lena Ferreira (P), Alison Fortin (F), Michael Drywa (G), Helen Marszalkowski (S).
Providence: Central HS, Milca Cruz (I); **La Salle Academy**, John Mulligan (F); **Classical HS**, Susanna Loppo (I), Gregory

Markel (L), Daniel Lieberman (F), Alexander Incera (S).
Smithfield: Smithfield HS, Linda Catuogno (S).
Wakefield: So Kingstown HS, Emily Ross (S), Harold Andersen (L), Barbara Gaines (F).
Warwick: Toll Gate HS, Paula Ficarra (S), Lisa Sabatini (F), Gregory Hagopian (I); **Pilgrim HS,** Denise Trvyan (S), Stephen Powell (F), Joanne Torkomian (I), Dalita John (G).
Warwick: Warwick Veterans HS, Susanne Bejian (F).

SOUTH CAROLINA
Myrtle Beach: Myrtle Beach HS, Debbie Roberts (F).
Walhalla: Walhalla Sr HS, Don Lusk (F, S).
Yonges Island: Baptist Hill HS, Dean Brown (F).

SOUTH DAKOTA
Sioux Falls: No American Baptist Seminary, Lyle Haerle (H), Keith Kinder (Greek).

TENNESSEE
Memphis: Immaculate Conception Cathedral HS, Marti Tippens (F), Sandra Baltz (S); **St Agnes Academy,** Susie Thompson (F).
Rogersville: Cherokee Comprehensive HS, Lila Collier (F).

TEXAS
Borger: Borger HS, Kenneth Wright (L).
Brownfield: Brownfield HS, Mechelle White (S).
Houston: Jones Sr HS, Renu Aggarwal (S).

UTAH
Hurricane: Hurricane HS, Michelle Shamo (S), Hilda Quintana (E), Chad Lauritzen (G).
Salt Lake City: Evergreen Jr HS, William Hardman (S).

VERMONT
Bennington: Mt. Anthony Union HS, Mollie Matteson.
Brattleboro: Brattleboro Union HS, James Masters (S), Meredith Wilcox (F).
Essex Junction: Essex Junction Educational Ctr, Kimberly Reed (S), Chad Creveling (L), Lorei Dawson (F).
Fair Haven: Fair Haven Union HS, Kim Bellrose (S), Leslie Perry (F).
Middlebury: Middlebury Union HS, Ashley Cross (F), Ultima Robinson (S); **Middlebury Union Jr HS,** Becky Pels (F), Betsy Bauer (L).
Northfield: Norwich Univ, David Walker (G), George Theall (S).
Plainfield: Twinfield Union HS, Allison Bohn (L).
South Burlington: So Burlington HS, Stuart Rosenthal (L), Carolyn Spinner (F).
Wells River: Blue Mountain Union School, Michael Marquise (F).

VIRGINIA
Annadale: Annadale HS, Kimberly Strobel (S).
Arlington: Bishop O'Connell HS, Regina DiValentin (F), Philip Golrick (L), Charles Smith (G); **Yorktown HS,** Patricia Uelmen (G), Cheryl Cole (F), Catharine Hartzenbusch (S).
Charlottesville: Univ of Virginia, Bonnie Rib (S); **Albemarle HS,** Allen Gleitz (F), Susan Musselman (S).
Daleville: Lord Botetourt HS, Rhonda Bowers (L), Judy Glover (F).
Emporia: Greensville County HS, Joyce Barnes (S).
Richmond: Manchester HS, Laura Ellison (F), Beth Duffie (L); **Douglas Freeman HS,** Alison Haller (F), Shi Fay Cheng (G), Laura Simmons (L).
Springfield: West Springfield HS, Mariana Shea (S), Darcy Ello (F), Steven Royster (L).
Tazewell: Tazewell HS, Regina Poskas (S), Lori Gregory (L).
Williamsburg: Lafayette HS, Debra Jackson (F), Pamela Wildenberger (S), John Matthews (L).

WASHINGTON
Colville: Colville Sr HS, Lisa Miller (S).
Kennewick: Kennewick HS, Kenneth Winstead, Jr (S).

WEST VIRGINIA
Clarksburg: Liberty HS, Connie Williams (S).
Fairmont: Fairmont Sr HS, Wendy Wells (S), John Knisely (F), Volkan Taskin (L).
Northfork: Northfork HS, Rebecca Angove (F).

WISCONSIN
Appleton: Xavier HS, Susan McIntyre (S), Kate Nigl (G), Betty VanAsten (F).
Fond Du Lac: St Mary's Spring's HS, Sue Borzick (F), Daniel Roemer (G), Tammy Bender (L), Daniel Barfknecht (S).
Maple: Northwestern HS, Janice Hespen (F).
Milwaukee: Mount Mary College, Mary Tobin (S).
Waukesha: Central Middle School, Dana Barre (F).
Wisconsin Dells: Wisconsin Dells HS, Betty Muller (S).

WYOMING
Casper: Natrona County HS, David Hankins (G), Linda Hunnicutt (F), Clark Haass (S).

Northeast Conference Officers and Directors Since 1954

Andersson, Theodore [Yale U.]* U. of Texas, Director 1954-56.
Andrews, Oliver, Jr., U. of Connecticut, Director 1971-74.
Arndt, Richard, Columbia U., Director 1961.
Arsenault, Philip E., Montgomery County (Md.) Public Schools, Local Chairman 1967, 1970; Director 1971, 1973-74; Vice Chairman 1975; Conference Chairman 1976.
Atkins, Jeannette, Staples (Westport, Conn.) HS, Director 1962-65.
Baird, Janet, U. of Maryland, Local Chairman 1974.
Bashour, Dora, [Hunter C.], Secretary 1963-1964; Recording Secretary 1965-68.
Baslaw, Annette S., [Teachers C.], Hunter C., Local Chairman 1973.
Bayerschmidt, Carl F., Columbia U., Conference Chairman 1961.
Bennett, Ruth, Queens C., Local Chairman 1975-76.
Bertin, Gerald A., Rutgers U., Local Chairman 1960.
Berwald, Jean-Pierre, U. Mass.-Amherst, Director 1980-83.
Bird, Thomas E., Queens C., Editor 1967-68; Director 1969.
Bishop, G. Reginald, Jr., Rutgers U., Editor 1960, 1965; Director 1961-62, 1965, 1968; Vice Chairman 1966; Conference Chairman 1967.
Bishop, Thomas, W., New York U., Local Chairman 1965.
Born, Warren C., [ACTFL], Editor 1974-79.
Bostroem, Kyra, Westover School, Director 1961.
Bottiglia, William F., MIT, Editor 1957, 1962-63; Director 1964.
Bourque, Jane M., [Stratford (Conn.) Public Schools] Mt. Vernon (N.Y.) Public Schools, Director 1974-75; Vice Chairman 1976; Conference Chairman 1977.
Bree, Germaine, [New York U., U. of Wisconsin] Wake Forest U., Conference Chairman 1955. Editor 1955.
Brod, Richard I., ADFL-MLA, Consultant to the Chairman, 1983.
Brooks, Nelson†, [Yale U.], Director 1954-57, 1960-61; Vice Chairman 1959.
Brown, Christine L., West Hartford (Conn.) Public Schools, Director 1982-85.
Cadoux, Remunda [Hunter C.], Vice Chairman 1969; Conference Chairman 1970.
Campbell, Hugh, (Roxbury Latin School] Rocky Hill Country Day School, Director 1966-67.
Churchill, J. Frederick, Hofstra U., Director 1966-67; Local Chairman 1971-72.
Ciotti, Marianne C., [Vermont State Department of Education, Boston U.] Barre (Vt.) Public Schools, Director 1967.
Cincinnato, Paul D., Farmingdale (N.Y.) Public Schools, Director 1974-77; Vice Chairman 1978, Conference Chairman 1979.
Cintas, Pierre F., [Dalhousie U.], Penn. St. U.-Ogontz, Director 1976-79.
Clark, John L.D., [ETS] CAL, Director 1976-1978, Vice Chairman 1979, Conference Chairman 1980.
Clark, Richard P., Newton (Mass.) HS, Director 1967.
Clemons, Brenda Frazier [Rutgers U.] U. of Connecticut,] Howard U., Director 1972-75.
Cobb, Martha, Howard U., Director 1976-77; Recording Secretary 1978.
Covey, Delvin L., [Montclair State C.] Spring Arbor C., Director 1964-65.
Crawford, Dorothy B., Philadelphia HS for Girls, Conference Chairman 1956.
Dahme, Lena F., Hunter C., Local Chairman 1958; Director 1959.
Darcey, John M., West Hartford (Conn.) Public Schools, Director 1978-81. Vice Chairman 1982, Conference Chairman 1983.
Del Olmo, Filomena Peloro, [Hackensack (N.J.) Public Schools], Fairleigh Dickinson U., Director 1960-63.
De Napoli, Anthony J., Local Co-chairman. 1980-82, Director 1982-85.
Didsbury, Robert, Weston (Conn.) JHS, Director 1966-69.
Dodge, James, W., Middlebury C., Editor 1971-73; Secretary-Teasurer 1974-85.
Doseri, Leon E.†, [Georgetown U.] Occidental C., Conference Chairman 1959.
Dufau, Micheline, U. of Massachusetts, Director 1976-79.
Dye, Joan C., Hunter C., Local Co-chairman 1978.
Eaton, Annette, Howard U., Director 1967-70.
Eddy, Frederick D.†, [U. of Colorado], Editor 1959; Director 1960.
Eddy, Peter A., [CAL/ERIC], CIA, Director 1977-78.
Edgerton, Mills F., Jr., Bucknell U., Editor 1969; Director 1970; Vice Chairman 1971; Conference Chairman 1972.
Elling, Barbara E., SUNY at Stony Brook, Director 1980-83.
Feindler, Joan L., Easton Williston (N.Y.) Public Schools, Director 1969-71; Vice Chairman 1972; Conference Chairman 1973.
Flaxman, Seymour, [New York U.] City C. of New York, Editor 1961; Director 1962.
Freeman, Stephen A., [Middlebury C.], Director 1957-60.
Fulton, Renee J., New York City Board of Education, Director 1955.
Gaarder, A. Bruce, USOE, Director 1971-74.
Geary, Edward J., [Harvard U.] Bowdoin C., Conference Chairman 1962.
Geno, Thomas H., U. of Vermont, Director 1975-76; Vice Chairman 1977; Conference Chairman 1978, Recording Secretary 1979, Editor 1980-81.
Gilman, Margaret†, Bryn Mawr C., Editor 1956.
Glaude, Paul M., N.Y. State Department of Education, Director 1963-66.
Golden, Herbert H., Boston U., Director 1962.
Grew, James H., [Phillips Acad.], Director 1966-69.
Hartle, Robert W., Queens C., Local Chairman 1966.
Harrison, John S., Baltimore County (Md.) Public Schools, Local Co-Chairman 1979, 1983; Director 1983-86.
Hayden, Hilary, O.S.B., [St. Anselm's Abbey School], Vice Chairman 1970; Conference Chairman 1971.
Hayes, Alfred S.†, CAL, Vice Chairman 1963; Conference Chairman 1964.
Hernandez, Juana A., Hood C., Director 1978-81.
Holzmann, Albert W., Rutgers U., Director 1960.
Jalbert, Emile H. [Thayer Acad.] Berkshire Comm. C., Local Chairman 1962.
Jebe, Suzanne, [Guilford (Conn.) HS], Minn. Dept. of Ed., Director 1975-76; Recording Secretary 1977.
Johnston, Marjorie C. [USOE], Local Chairman 1964.
Jones, George W., Jr., Norfolk (Va.) Public Schools, Director 1977-80.
Kahn, Timothy M., S. Burlington (Vt.) HS, Director 1979-82.
Keesee, Elizabeth, USOE, Director 1966-70.
Kellenberger, Hunter†, [Brown U.], Conference Chairman 1954; Editor 1954.
Kesler, Robert, Phillips Exeter Acad., Director 1957.
Kibbe, Doris E., Montclair State C., Director 1968-69.
La Follette, James E., Georgetown, U., Local chairman 1959.
La Fontaine, Hernan, New York City Board of Education Director 1972.
Lenz, Harold, Queens C., Local Chairman 1961.
Lepke, Helen S., Kent St. U., Director 1981-84.
Lester, Kenneth A., Connecticut State Dept. of Education, Recording Secretary 1982.
Levy, Harry, [Hunter C.] Fordham U., Editor 1958; Director 1959-61; Conference Chairman 1963.
Levy, Stephen L., [New York City Board of Education] Roslyn (N.Y.) Public Schools, Local Co-Chairman 1978, 80-82, Director 1980-83; Vice Chairman 1984;

Conference Chairman 1985.
Lieberman, Samuel, Queens C., Director 1966-69.
Lipton, Gladys C., [New York City Board of Education], Anne Arundel County (Md.) Public Schools, Director 1973-76.
Lloyd, Paul M., U. of Pennsylvania, Local Chairman 1963.
Locke, William N., MIT, Conference Chairman 1957; Director 1958-59.
Loew, Helene Z., N.Y. State Education Dept., Director 1977-79; Vice Chairman 1980; Conference Chairman 1981.
MacAllister, Archibald T.†, [Princeton U.] Director 1955-57; 1959-61.
Masciantonio, Rudolph, School District of Philadelphia, Director 1969-71.
Mead, Robert G., Jr., U. of Connecticut, Director 1955; Editor 1966; Vice Chairman 1967; Conference Chairman 1968, Editor 1982-83.
Mesnard, Andre, Barnard C., Director 1954-55.
Micozzi, Arthur L., Baltimore County (Md.) Public Schools, Local Committee Chairman, 1977, 1979, 1983; Director 1979-82.
Mirsky, Jerome G., [Jericho (N.Y.) SHS], Shoreham-Wading River (N.Y.) HS, Director 1970-73; Vice Chairman 1974; Conference Chairman 1975.
Nelson, Robert J., [U. of Pennsylvania] U. of Illinois, Director 1965-68.
Neuse, Werner, [Middlebury C.], Director 1954-56.
Obstfeld, Roland, Northport (N.Y.) HS, Recording Secretary 1976.
Owens, Doris Barry, West Hartford (Conn.) Public Schools, Recording Secretary 1983.
Pane, Remigio U., Rutgers W., Conference Chairman 1960.
Paquette, Andre, [Middlebury C.] Laconia (N.H.) Public Sch., Director 1963-66; Vice Chairman 1968; Conference Chairman 1969.
Parks Carolyn, U. of Md., Recording Secretary 1981.
Perkins, Jean, Swarthmore C., Treasurer 1963-64; Conference Chairman 1966.
Phillips, June K., Indiana U. of Pa., Director 1979-82, Vice Chairman 1983; Conference Chairman 1984.
Prochoroff, Marina, [MLA Materials Center], Director 1962-64.
Ramirez, Mario L., School District of Philadelphia, Director 1974.
Reilly, John H., Queens C., Local Chairman 1968-69; Director 1970.
Russo, Gloria M., U. of Virginia, Director 1983-86.
Sandstrom, Eleanor L., School District of Philadelphia, Director 1975-78.
Selvi, Arthur M., Central Connecticut State C., Director 1954.
Senn, Alfred, U. of Pennsylvania, Director 1956.
Serafino, Robert, New Haven (Conn.) Public Schools, Director 1969-73.
Sheppard, Douglas C. [SUNY at Buffalo] Arizona State U., Director 1968-71.
Shilaeff, Ariadne, Wheaton C., Director 1978-80.
Shuster, George N., [U. of Notre Dame], Conference Chairman 1958.
Simches, Seymour O., Tufts U., Director 1962-65; Vice Chairman 1965.
Sims, Edna N., U. of D.C., Director 1981-84.
Sister Margaret Pauline, Emmanuel C., Director 1957, 1965-68; Recording Secretary 1969-1975.
Sister Margaret Therese, Trinity C., Director 1959-60.
Sister Mary Pierre, Georgian Court C., Director 1961-64.
Sparks, Kimberly, Middlebury C., Director 1969-72.
Starr, Wilmarth H., [U. of Maine] New York U., Director 1960-63, 1966; Vice Chairman 1964; Conference Chairman 1965.
Steer, Alfred G., Jr., Columbia U., Director 1961.
Stein, Jack M.†, [Harvard U.], Director 1962.
Tamarkin, Toby, Manchester (Conn.) Comm. College, Director 1977-80, Vice Chairman 1981, Conference Chairman 1982.
Thompson, Mary P., [Glastonbury (Conn.) Public Schools], Director 1957-62.
Trivelli, Remo J., U. of R.I. Director 1981-84.
Tursi, Joseph, SUNY at Stony Brook, Editor 1970; Director 1971-72; Vice Chairman 1973; Conference Chairman 1974.
Valette, Rebecca, Boston C., Director 1972-75.
Vasquez-Amaral, Jose, Rutgers U., Director 1960.
Walker, Richard H., Bronxville (N.Y.) HS, Director 1954.
Walsh, Donald D.†, [MLA], Director 1954; Secretary-Treasurer 1965-73.
White, Emile Margaret, [District of Columbia Public Schools], Director 1955-58.
Williamson, Richard C., Bates College, Director 1983-86.
Woodford, Protase E., Educational Testing Service, Director 1982-85.
Yakobson, Helen B., George Washington U., Director 1959-60.

*Where a change of academic affiliation is known, the earlier address appears in brackets.

Index of the Northeast Conference Reports, 1954-1983

This index of the 30 annual *Northeast Conference Reports* lists, in alphabetical order, the title of each chapter in the 30 volumes published. Refer to the "Contents of Northeast Conference Reports" on the following pages for the other articles in each volume. Be sure to order by the volume title using the order form provided. When ordering specific chapters, take care not to order duplicate volumes when more than one desired chapter appears in the same volume.

The American Language Association: Toward New Strength, Visibility, and Effectiveness as a Profession. David P. Benseler, in *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.*

American Sign Language. Marilyn J. Conwell, April Nelson in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*

An Anthropological Concept of Culture. Ernestine Friedl, in *Culture in Language Learning.*

Applications of Computer Technology in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning. John S. Harrison in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*

Audiovisual Materials and Techniques for Teaching Foreign Languages: Recent Trends and Activities. Carolyn H. Parks in *The Foreign Language Teacher. The Lifelong Learner.*

Die Bundesrepublik heute. Barbara Elling, Kurt Elling in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*

Careers, Community, and Public Awareness. L. Lavergneau, in *Toward Student-Centered Foreign Language Programs.*

The Case for Latin. William Riley Parker, in *Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession.*

The Challenge of Bilingualism. A. Bruce Gaarder, in *Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession.*

The Chinese Language. David Gidman in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*

A Chronical: Political, Professional, and Public Activities Surrounding the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. Thomas H. Geno in *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration.*

Classical and Modern Foreign Languages: Common Areas and Problems. Barbara P. McCarthy, in *Culture, Literature, and Articulation.*

Classics in America. Grace Crawford, in *Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons.*

The Classroom Revisited. Seymour O. Simches, in *Foreign Language Learning: Research and Development.*

Competence in a Foreign Language: A Valuable Adjunct Skill in the 80's? Mills F. Edgerton, Jr., in *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.*

The Continuum: Listening and Speaking. Simon Belasco, in *Language Learning: The Intermediate Phase.*

Coordination between Classroom and Laboratory. Guillermo del Olmo, in *Modern Language Teaching in School and College.*

Coordination in Foreign Language Teaching. Genevieve S. Blew, in *Language Teaching: Broader Contexts.*

La Cultura Contemporanea de Hispanoamerica. Frank Dauster in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*

Definition of Language Competencies through Testing. Nelson Brooks, in *The Language Learner.*

The Drop-Out of Students after the Second Year. Renee J. Fulton, in *The Language Classroom.*

Educational Goals: The Foreign Language Teacher's Response. Wilga M. Rivers, in *The Foreign Language Teacher in Today's Classroom Environment.*

Educational Technology. James W. Dodge, in *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.*

Elementary and Junior High School Curricula. Filomena C. Peloro, in *The Language Learner.*

Elementary School Foreign Language: Key Link in the Chain of Learning. Myriam Met, et al, in *Foreign Language: Key Links in the Chain of Learning.*

La Espana de Hoy. John M. Darcey in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*

Exchanges and Travel Abroad in Secondary Schools. Claudia S. Travers in *Foreign Languages and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration.*

Foreign Language Instruction in Elementary Schools. Arthur S. Selvi, in *Foreign Language Teachers and Tests.*

Foreign Language Instruction in Elementary Schools. Mary P. Thompson, in *Foreign Language Tests and Techniques.*

Foreign Language Instruction in Secondary Schools. Ruth P. Kroeger, in *Foreign Language Tests and Techniques.*

Foreign Language Instruction in Secondary Schools. Robert G. Mead, Jr., in *Culture, Literature, and Articulation.*

The Foreign Language Program, Grades 3-12. Margaret E. Eaton, in *The Language Teacher.*

Foreign Languages and the 'Other' Student. Vicki Galloway in *Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning.*

Foreign Languages for All Students? Eleanor L. Sandstrom in *Foreign Languages and the 'New' Student.*

Foreign Languages in Colleges and Universities. Roger L. Hadlich, in *Foreign Language Teaching: Ideals and Practices.*

Foreign Languages in the Elementary School. Conrad J. Schmitt, in *Foreign Language Teaching: Ideals and Practices.*

Foreign Languages in the Secondary School. Milton R. Hahn, in *Foreign Language Teaching: Ideals and Practices.*

Foreign Languages in the Secondary School: Reconciling the Dream with the Reality. Alice C. Omaggio, et al, in *Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning.*

France. Gerard J. Brault, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*

La France Contemporaine. Pierre Maubrey in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*

French Canada, Marine Leland, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*
The French-Speaking: Origins, Cultural Pluralism, Contributions, Suggestions, for Classroom Implementation, Normand C. Dube, in *Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons.*
From School to College: The Problem of Continuity, Micheline Dufau, in *Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession.*
The German-Speaking: Origins, Cultural Pluralism, Contributions, Suggestions for Classroom Implementation, Helene Z. Loew, in *Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons.*
Germany, Harry F. Young, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*
The Ghosts in the Language Classroom: College Foreign Language Departments, College Board Examinations, the Administration, the Textbook, Donald D. Walsh, in *The Language Teacher.*
Global Responsibility: The Role of the Foreign Language Teacher, Helene Z. Loew, Donald H. Bragaw, Judith S. Wooster in *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration.*
Goals Clarification: Background and Implementation, Ann A. Zeusch, John L.D. Clark, and Stephen L. Levy, in *Goals Clarification: Curriculum, Teaching, Evaluation.*
Greece and Rome, Samuel Lieberman, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*
Implementing Student-Centered Foreign Language Programs, Anthony Papalia, in *Towards Student-Centered Foreign Language Programs.*
Individualization of Instruction, Ronald L. Gougher, in *Sensitivity in the Foreign Language Classroom.*
Innovative Foreign Language Programs, Oliver Andrews, Jr., in *Foreign Language Learning: Research and Development.*
Innovative Trends, Francois Hugot, in *Leadership for Continuing Development.*
Inservice Involvement in the Process of Change, Jerome G. Mirsky, in *Leadership for Continuing Development.*
Intensive Japanese, Toshiko Phipps, Jean-Pierre Berwald in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*
Intensive Latin, Marie Cleary in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*
Intensive Portuguese, Rosemarie Pedro Carvalho in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*
Intensive Russian, Robert L. Baker in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*
Interaction in the Foreign Language Class, Gertrude Moskowitz, in *Sensitivity in the Foreign Language Classroom.*
International Training, Lucia Pierce in *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration.*
L'Italia Contemporanea, Remo J. Trivelli in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*
Italy and the Italians, Joseph A. Tursi, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*
Japan, Walter F. Odronic, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*
Language Acquisition, Pierre F. Cintas, in *Language: Acquisition, Application, Appreciation.*
Language Application, Kenneth Lester, in *Language: Acquisition, Application, Appreciation.*
Language Appreciation, Germaine Bree, in *Language: Acquisition, Application, Appreciation.*
A Language Learner in Today's Foreign Language Classroom, Carol Hosenfeld, in *The Foreign Language Teacher in Today's Classroom Environment.*
Learning a Modern Foreign Language for Communication, Nelson Brooks, in *Modern Language Teaching in School and College.*
Liberated Expression, Mills F. Edgerton, Jr., in *Foreign Language Learning: Research and Development.*
Linguistic Aids, Richard H. Walker, in *Foreign Language Teachers and Tests.*
Linguistics and Language Teaching, Robert A. Hall, Jr., in *Current Issues in Language Teaching.*
Means of Meeting the Shortage of Teachers, Carolyn E. Bock, in *The Language Teacher.*
Merging Methods and Texts: A Pragmatic Approach, Elizabeth G. Joiner, June K. Phillips in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*
Modern Foreign Language Learning: Assumptions and Implications, Wilmarth H. Starr, in *The Language Learner.*
Motion Pictures, Allen W. Grundstrom, in *Sight and Sound: The Sensible and Sensitive Use of Audio-Visual Aids.*
Motivation in Foreign Language Learning, Robert J. Nelson, in *Foreign Languages and the 'New' Student.*
A National Overview of Immigration, Edward K. Muller, in *Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons.*
New Approaches to Assessment of Language Learning, Helen L. Jorstad, in *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.*
New Contents, Rebecca M. Valette, in *New Contents, New Teachers, New Publics.*
New Publics, Joseph A. Tursi, in *New Contents, New Teachers, New Publics.*
New Teachers, William E. DeLorenzo, in *New Contents, New Teachers, New Publics.*
Non-Projected Visuals, Brenda Frazier, in *Sight and Sound: The Sensible and Sensitive Use of Audio-Visual Aids.*
Nurturing the Ties that Bind: Links between the Foreign Language Departments and the Rest of the Post-Secondary Educational Enterprise, Claire Gaudiani, et al, in *Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning.*
The Overhead Projector, James J. Wrenn, in *Sight and Sound: The Sensible and Sensitive Use of Audio-Visual Aids.*
Present Status of Foreign Language Teaching: A Northeast Conference Survey, Peter A. Eddy, in *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.*
Proficiency Testing in Second Language Classrooms, Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro, Protase E. Woodford in *The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner.*
Reactions of the Northeast Conference to the Recommendations of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies in *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration.*
The Role of Literature in Language Teaching, Robert J. Clements, in *Foreign Language Tests and Techniques.*

The Role of Literature in Language Teaching. Archibald T. MacAllister, in *Culture, Literature, and Articulation.*

The Second Language Teacher: A Problem of Reconciling the Vision with the Reality. Gilbert A. Jarvis, in *The Foreign Language Teacher in Today's Classroom Environment.*

Single vs. Multiple Languages in Secondary Schools. James H. Grew, in *The Language Teacher.*

A Six-Year Sequence. Gordon R. Silber, in *The Language Learner.*

Slides and Filmstrips. Hilary Hayden in *Sight and Sound: The Sensible and Sensitive Use of Audio-Visual Aids.*

Sociocultural Aspects of Foreign Language Study. G. Richard Tucker and Wallace E. Lambert, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*

Sound Recordings. Jermaine Arendt, in *Sight and Sound: The Sensible and Sensitive Use of Audio-visual Aids.*

The Soviet Union. Irina Kirk, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*

Spain. John W. Kronik, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*

Spanish America. Frank N. Dauster, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*

The Spanish-Speaking: Origins, Cultural Pluralism, Contributions, Suggestions for Classroom Implementation. John M. Darcey, in *Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons.*

Spoken Language Tests. Nelson Brooks, in *The Language Classroom.*

Study Abroad. Stephen A. Freeman, in *Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession.*

A Survey of FLES Practices. Nancy V. Alkonis and Mary A. Brophy, in *Current Issues in Language Teaching.*

Teaching Aids and Techniques. Jeanne V. Pleasants, in *The Language Classroom.*

Teaching Aids and Techniques: Principles, Demonstrations. Jeanne V. Pleasants, in *Culture, Literature, and Articulation.*

Teaching Aids and Techniques: The Secondary School Language Laboratory. Frederick D. Eddy, in *Foreign Language Tests and Techniques.*

On Teaching Another Language as Part of Another Culture. Joey L. Dillard, in *Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture.*

Teaching Literature for Admission to College with Advanced Standing. Blanche A. Price, in *The Language Classroom.*

The Teaching of Classical and Modern Foreign Languages: Common Areas and Problems. Josephine P. Bree, in *Foreign Language Tests and Techniques.*

Teaching of Classical Cultures. Doris E. Kibbe, in *Culture in Language Learning.*

The Teaching of Literature. Norman L. Torrey, in *Foreign Language Teachers and Texts.*

The Teaching of Reading. William G. Moulton, in *Foreign Language: Reading, Literature, Requirements.*

Teaching of Slavic Cultures. Leon I. Twarog, in *Culture in Language Learning.*

Teaching of Western European Cultures. Ira Wade, in *Culture in Language Learning.*

The Teaching of Writing. Jeannette Atkins, in *The Language Teacher.*

Teaching Spanish to the Native Spanish Speaker. Hernan LaFontaine, in *Sensitivity in the Foreign Language Classroom.*

Television. Joseph H. Sheehan, in *Sight and Sound: The Sensible and Sensitive Use of Audio-Visual Aids.*

Tests: All Skills, Speaking Tests. Nelson Brooks, in *Culture, Literature, and Articulation.*

Tests: Listening Comprehension, Other Skills. Nelson Brooks, in *Foreign Language Teachers and Tests.*

Tests: Speaking Test. Stanley M. Sapon, in *Foreign Language Tests and Techniques.*

Toward a Multidimensional Foreign Language Curriculum. H. H. Stern in *Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning.*

The Times and Places for Literature. F. Andre Paquette, in *Foreign Languages: Reading, Literature, Requirements.*

Toward an Articulated Curriculum. Robert C. Lafayette, in *Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions.*

Thirty Years of the Northeast Conference: A Personal Perspective. Jane McFarland Bourque in *Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning.*

Toward an International Dimension in Higher Education. Richard C. Williamson in *Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration.*

Training for Student-Centered Language Programs. Annette S. Baslaw and Joan S. Freilich, in *Toward Student-Centered Foreign Language Programs.*

The Transition to the Classroom. Evangeline Galas, in *Modern Language Teaching in School and College.*

Trends in Foreign Language Requirements and Placement. John F. Gummere, in *Foreign Languages: Reading, Literature, Requirements.*

Wider Uses for Foreign Languages. Brownlee Sands Corrin, in *Language Teaching: Broader Contexts.*

Writing as Expression. Marina Prochoroff, in *Language Learning: The Intermediate Phase.*

Contents of the Northeast Conference Reports, 1954-1983

The contents of each of the 30 volumes of the Northeast Conference Reports are listed on these pages. See the "Index of Northeast Conference Reports" on the preceding pages for alphabetical listing by the title of the chapters. Be sure to order by the volume title as shown on this page using the order form provided. When ordering specific chapters, take care not to order duplicate volumes when more than one desired chapter appears in the same volume.

Culture in Language Learning. G. Reginald Bishop, Jr., ed: Ernestine Friedl: "An Anthropological Concept of Culture." William E. Welmers: "Language as Culture." Ira Wade: "Teaching of Western European Cultures." Doris E. Kibbe: "Teaching of Classical Cultures." Leon I. Twarog: "Teaching of Slavic Cultures." ..... paper $7.95

Culture, Literature, and Articulation. Germaine Bree, ed. Laurence Wylie: "The Place of Culture and Civilization in FL Teaching." A.T. MacAllister: "The Role of Literature in Language Teaching." Mary P. Thompson: "FL Instruction in Elementary Schools." Robert G. Mead, Jr.: "FL Instruction in Secondary Schools." Barbara P. McCarthy: "Classical and Modern FLs: Common Areas and Problems." Nelson Brooks: "Tests: All Skills, Speaking Test. A.G. Grace: "The Preparation of FL Teachers." J.V. Pleasants: "Teaching Aids and Techniques: Principles, Demonstrations." W.H. Starr: "The Role of FLs in American Life." ..... paper $7.95

Current Issues in Language Teaching. William F. Bottiglia, ed. Robert A. Hall, Jr.: "Linguistics and Language Teaching." Alfred S. Hayes: "Programmed Learning." Nancy V. Alkonis and Mary A. Brophy: "A Survey of FLES Practices." ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration. Thomas H. Geno, ed.: "A Chronical: Political, Professional, and Public Activities Surrounding the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies." Helene Z. Loew, Donald H. Bragaw, and Judith S. Wooster: "Global Responsibility: The Role of the Foreign Language Teacher." Claudia S. Travers: "Exchanges and Travel Abroad in Secondary Schools." Richard C. Williamson: "Toward an International Dimension in Higher Education." Lucia Pierce: "International Training." "Reactions of the Northeast Conference to the Recommendations of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies." ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Language Learning: Research and Development. Thomas E. Bird, ed. Oliver Andrews, Jr.: "Innovative FL Programs." Seymour O. Simches: "The Classroom Revisited." Mills F. Edgerton, Jr.: "Liberated Expression." ..... paper $7.95

The Foreign Language Teacher in Today's Classroom Environment. Warren C. Born, ed. Wilga M. Rivers: "Educational Goals: The Foreign Language Teacher's Response." Carol Hosenfeld: "Cindy: A Language Learner in Today's Foreign Language Classroom." Gilbert A. Jarvis: "The Second Language Teacher: A Problem of Reconciling the Vision with the Reality." ..... paper $7.95

The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner. Robert G. Mead, Jr., ed. Marilyn J. Conwell and April Nelson: "American Sign Language." David Gidman: "The Chinese Language." Toshiko Phipps and Jean-Pierre Berwald: "Intensive Japanese." Marie Cleary: "Intensive Latin." Rosemarie Pedro Carvalho: "Intensive Portuguese." Robert L. Baker: "Intensive Russian." Pierre Maubrey: "La France Contemporaine." Barbara Elling and Kurt Elling: "Die Bundesrepublik heute." Remo J. Trivelli: "L'Italia Contemporanea." John M. Darcey: "La Espana de Hoy." Frank Dauster: "La Cultura Contemporanea de Hispanoamerica." Elizabeth G. Joiner and June K. Phillips: "Merging Methods and Texts: A Pragmatic Approach." Judith E. Liskin-Gasparro and Protase E. Woodford: "Proficiency Testing in Second Language Classrooms." Carolyn H. Parks: "Audiovisual Materials and Techniques for Teaching Foreign Languages: Recent Trends and Activities." John S. Harrison: "Applications of Computer Technology in Foreign Language Teaching and Learning." ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Language Teachers and Tests. Hunter Kellenberger, ed. Stephen A. Freeman: "The Qualifications of FL Teachers." Arthur S. Selvi: "FL Instruction in Elementary Schools." Nelson Brooks: "Tests: Listening Comprehension, Other Skills." Norman L. Torrey: "The Teaching of Literature." Theodore Andersson: "The Role of FLs in American Life." Richard H. Walker: "Linguistic Aids." ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Language Tests and Techniques. Margaret Gilman, ed. Frederick D. Eddy: "Teaching Aids and Techniques: The Secondary School Language Laboratory." Stanley M. Sapon: "Tests: Speaking Tests." Mary P. Thompson: "FL Instruction in Elementary Schools." Ruth P. Kroeger. "FL Instruction in Secondary Schools." Josephine P. Bree: "The Teaching of Classical and Modern FLs: Common Areas and Prob-

lems." Robert J. Clements: "The Role of Literature in Language Teaching." John B. Carroll and William C. Sayers: "The Place of Culture and Civilization in FL Teaching." Wilmarth H. Starr: "The Role of FLs in American Life." ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession. G. Reginald Bishop, Jr., ed. William Riley Parker: "The Case for Latin." Stephen A. Freeman: "Study Abroad." A. Bruce Gaarder: "The Challenge of Bilingualism." Micheline Dufau: "From School to College: The Problem of Continuity." ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Language Teaching: Ideals and Practices. George F. Jones, ed. Conrad J. Schmitt: "FL's in the Elementary School." Milton R. Hahn: "FL's in the Secondary School." Roger L. Hadlich: "FL's in Colleges and Universities." ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Languages and the 'New' Student. Joseph A. Tursi, ed. Robert F. Serafino: "A Relevant Curriculum: An Instrument for Polling Student Opinion." Robert J. Nelson: "Motivation in FL Learning." Eleanor J. Sandstrom: "FLs for All Students?" ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning. Robert G. Mead, Jr., ed. Myriam Met, et al: "Elementary School Foreign Language: Key Link in the Chain of Learning." Alice C. Omaggio, et al: "Foreign Languages in the Secondary Schools: Reconciling the Dream with the Reality." Claire Gaudiani, et al: "Nurturing the Ties that Bind: Links between Foreign Language Departments and the Rest of the Post-Secondary Educational Enterprise." Vicki Galloway: "Foreign Languages and the 'Other' Student." H. H. Stern: "Toward a Multidimensional Foreign Language Curriculum." Jane McFarland Bourque: "Thirty Years of the Northeast Conference: A Personal Perspective." ..... paper $7.95

Foreign Languages: Reading, Literature, Requirements. Thomas E. Bird, ed. William G. Moulton: "The Teaching of Reading." F.A. Paquette: "The Times and Places for Literature." John F. Gummere: "Trends in FL Requirements and Placement." ..... paper $7.95

Goals Clarification: Curriculum, Teaching, Evaluation. Warren C. Born, ed. Ann A. Beusch, John L.D. Clark, Stephen L. Levy: "Goals Clarification: Background" and "Goals Clarification: Implementation." ..... paper $7.95

Language: Acquisition, Application, Appreciation. Warren C. Born, ed. Pierre F. Cintas: "Language Acquisition." Kenneth Lester: "Language Application." Germaine Bree: "Language Appreciation." ..... paper $7.95

Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons. Warren C. Born, ed. Norman C. Dube: "The French Speaking." Helene Z. Loew: "The German Speaking." John M. Darcey: "The Spanish Speaking." Grace Crawford: "Classics in America." ..... paper $7.95

The Language Classroom. William F. Bottiglia, ed. Blanche A. Price: "Teaching Literature for Admission to College with Advanced Standing." Nelson Brooks: "Spoken Language Tests." James H. Grew: "The Place of Grammar and the Use of English in the Teaching of FLs." Renee J. Fulton: "The Drop-Out of Students after the Second Year." John B. Archer: "The Philosophy of the Language Laboratory." Jeanne V. Pleasants: "Teaching Aids and Techniques." ..... paper $7.95

The Language Learner. F.D. Eddy, ed. Wilmarth Starr: "Modern FL Learning: Assumptions and Implications." G.R. Silber: "A Six-Year Sequence." Filomena C. Peloro: "Elementary and Junior High School Curricula." Nelson Brooks: "Definition of Language Competencies through Testing." ..... paper $7.95

Language Learning: The Intermediate Phase. W.F. Bottiglia, ed: Simon Belasco: "The Continuum: Listening and Speaking." George Scherer: "Reading for Meaning." Marina Prochoroff: "Writing as Expression." ..... paper $7.95

The Language Teacher. Harry L. Levy, ed. Jeannette Atkins: "The Teaching of Writing." James H. Grew: "Single vs. Multiple Languages in Secondary Schools." Margaret E. Eaton: "The FL Program, Grades 3-12." Dorothy Brodin: "Patterns as Grammar." Donald D. Walsh: "The Ghosts in the Language Classroom: College FL Departments, College Board Examinations, the Administration, the Textbook." Carolyn E. Bock: "Means of Meeting the Shortage of Teachers. ..... paper $7.95

Language Teaching: Broader Contexts. Robert G. Mead, Jr., ed. Edward D. Sullivan: "Research and Language Learning." Brownlee Sands Corrin: "Wider Uses for FLs." Genevieve S. Blew: "Coordination of FL Teaching." ..... paper $7.95

Leadership for Continuing Development. James W. Dodge, ed. James R. Powers: "Professional Responsibilities." Jerome G. Mirsky: "Inservice Involvement in the Process of Change." Francois Hugot: "Innovative Trends." ..... paper $7.95

Modern Language Teaching in School and College. Seymour L. Flaxman, ed. Nelson Brooks: "Foreword: Learning a Modern FL and Communication." Genevieve S. Blew: "The Preparation of Secondary School Teachers." Jack M. Stein: "The Preparation of College and University Teachers." Evangeline Galas: "The Transition to the Classroom." Guillermo del Olmo: "Coordination between Classroom and Laboratory." ..... paper $7.95

New Cases for Foreign Language Study. June K. Phillips comp. An essential handbook for concerned foreign language teachers at both the secondary and collegiate levels. Deals with theory and practice, rational and defense of foreign language curricula. If you were ever asked to speak in defense of foreign language and international studies in your school, college, or university, "New Cases" would provide you with a concise reference source to strengthen your case. ..... paper $6.95

New Contents, New Teachers, New Publics. Warren C. Born, ed. Rebecca M. Valette: "New Contents." William E. DeLorenzo: "New Teachers." Joseph A. Tursi: "New Publics." ... paper $7.95

Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture. James W. Dodge, ed. Joey L. Dillard: "On Teaching Another Language as Part of Another Culture." G.R. Tucker and Wallace E. Lambert: "Sociocultural Aspects of FL Study." Samuel Lieberman: Greece and Rome; Gerard J. Brault: France; Marine Leland: French Canada; Harry F. Young: Germany; Joseph Tursi: Italy; Walter F. Odronic: Japan; Irina Kirk: The Soviet Union; John W. Kronik: Spain; Frank N. Dauster: Spanish America ..... paper $7.95

Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions. Thomas H. Geno, ed. Peter A. Eddy: "Current Status of Foreign Language Teaching: A Northeast Conference Survey." Robert C. Lafayette: "Toward an Articulated Curriculum." Mills F. Edgerton, Jr.: "Competence in a Foreign Language: A Valuable Adjunct Skill in the Eighties?" James W. Dodge: "Educational Technology." Helen L. Jorstad: "New Approaches to Assessment of Language Learning." David P. Benseler: "The American Language Association: Toward New Strength, Visibility, and Effectiveness as a Profession." ... paper $7.95

Sensitivity in the Foreign-Language Classroom. James W. Dodge, ed. Gertrude Moskowitz: "Interaction in the Foreign-Language Class." Hernan LaFontaine: "Teaching Spanish to the Native Spanish Speaker." Ronald L. Gougher: "Individualization of Instruction." ..... paper $7.95

Sight and Sound: The Sensible and Sensitive Use of Audio-Visual Aids. Mills F. Edgerton, Jr., ed. Brenda Frazier: "Non-Projected Visuals." Jermaine Arendt: "Sound Recordings." Hilary Hayden: "Slides and Filmstrips." James J. Wrenn: "The Overhead Projector." Allen W. Grundstrom: "Motion Pictures." Joseph H. Sheehan: "Television." ..... paper $7.95

Toward Student-Centered Foreign-Language Programs. Warren C. Born, ed. Annette S. Baslaw and Joan S. Freilich: "Training for Student-Centered Language Programs." Anthony Papalia: "Implementing Student-Centered Foreign-Language Programs." Rene L. Lavergneau: "Careers, Community, and Public Awareness." ..... paper $7.95

How to Order

All publication orders must be prepaid either by check or through your VISA or MASTERCARD. No bills will be sent. The added shipping and handling charge includes shipment by UPS; please give us your street address rather than post office box number for best service. Thank you.

ORDER FORM

Detach this form and mail to:

Northeast Conference Publications
Box 623 — Middlebury, VT 05753

ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID.

Description	Qty.	Price	Total
Culture in Language Learning		$7.95	
Culture, Literature, and Articulation		7.95	
Current Issues in Language Teaching		7.95	
Foreign Language and International Studies: Toward Cooperation and Integration		7.95	
Foreign Language Learning: Research and Development		7.95	
The Foreign Language Teacher in Today's Classroom Environment		7.95	
The Foreign Language Teacher: The Lifelong Learner		7.95	
Foreign Language Teachers and Texts		7.95	
Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession		7.95	
Foreign Language Teaching: Ideals and Practices		7.95	
Foreign Language Tests and Techniques		7.95	
Foreign Languages and The 'New' Student		7.95	
Foreign Languages: Key Links in the Chain of Learning		7.95	
Foreign Languages: Reading, Literature, Requirements		7.95	
Goals Clarification: Curriculum, Teaching, Evaluation		7.95	
Language: Acquisition, Application, Appreciation		7.95	
Language and Culture: Heritage and Horizons		7.95	
The Language Classroom		7.95	
The Language Learner		7.95	
Language Learning: The Intermediate Phase		7.95	
The Language Teacher		7.95	
Language Teaching: Broader Contexts		7.95	
Leadership for Continuing Development		7.95	
Modern Language Teaching in School and College		7.95	
New Cases for Foreign Language Study		6.95	
New Contents, New Teachers, New Publics		7.95	
Other Words, Other Worlds: Language in Culture		7.95	
Our Profession: Present Status and Future Directions		7.95	
Sensitivity in the Foreign Language Classroom		7.95	
Sight and Sound: The Sensible and Sensitive Use of Audio-Visual Aids		7.95	
Toward Student-Centered Foreign Language Programs		7.95	
SUBTOTAL			
Shipping and Handling			$2.00
GRAND TOTAL			

NAME (please print)

ADDRESS

CITY STATE ZIP

[ ] Check Enclosed [ ] Charge to VISA [ ] Charge to MASTERCARD

CARD NO. EXP. DATE

MASTERCARD BANK NO. SIGNATURE